Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XIII., No. 10. JANUARY, 1924.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
The Malines Conferences	517
Anti-Modernism in America	520
The Modernist Defence	523
The Modern Churchmen's Union in America	525
Revision of the Liturgy	527
The Confession of Faith of Bishop Lawrence — The Editor.	529
Mgr. Louis Duchesne — Percy Gardner, D.Litt., F.B.A.	537
The Spiritual Poets of the Seventeenth Century — J. H. Fowler.	542
Lily Dougall — Harold Anson.	550
The Call to Service — Nowell Smith, M.A.	555
Book Reviews:—	
Ideals in the Church of England	561
Christian Tradition and Modern Thought	563
Ecclesia Anglicana: For what does She stand?	565
Voices from the Past	567
Correspondence:—	
The Psychological Basis of Confession	568
Prayer Book Revision at the Cross-Roads	572

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.

NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

CURWEN EDITION
COMMUNION SERVICES FOR CHOIR & CONGREGATION

By MARTIN SHAW.

***AN ANGLICAN FOLK MASS** (80583)
'A modern composition with the mediæval ring.'—*Church Times.*

***MERBECKE'S HOLY COMMUNION** (80572)
Edited with Organ Accompaniment.
'Mr. Shaw is justified in producing this. We think it will win favour widely.'—*Church Times.*

***A MODAL COMMUNION SERVICE** (80558)
'The very thing for which we are asked.'—*Church Times.*

A PARISH COMMUNION SERVICE (80591)
Incorporating some Hymn Tunes.
Price **6d.** each.

A Special Vocal Edition for the Congregation at **3d.** may be had for those marked *.

By DR. C. W. PEARCE.

OFFICE OF THE HOLY COMMUNION (80588)
Largely founded on Ancient Melodies.
'Interesting . . . at the same time preserving the right kind of ecclesiastical atmosphere.'—*Organist and Choirmaster.*
Price **6d.**

London: J. CURWEN & SONS, Ltd., 24 Berners Street, W. 1.

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by Bishop BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. BURGE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Principal—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

Full particulars as to the Course, terms, fees, exhibitions, &c., can be had on application to the Principal.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall.

TAILORS SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,
13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.
(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1924. Vol. XIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Malines Conferences.

In the sixteenth century the *Ecclesia Anglicana* parted definitely, after much bloodshed and violence, from the *Ecclesia Romana.* Since then the deep-seated feeling in the hearts of typical Englishmen has been that Rome is a menace not only to our religious but also to our national life. The part played by the Vatican during the late war did nothing to allay that feeling. The myth that Henry VIII's domestic difficulties were the cause of the English Reformation is losing credibility with the advance of education. The Church of England parted from the Church of Rome on the interpretation of three passages in the Gospels, on which the Roman system, theologically and ecclesiastically, is built. These passages are (1) The *Tu es Petrus* : 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.' (2) The *Ave Maria, gratia plena* : 'Hail, Mary, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee.' (3) The *Hoc est corpus meum* : 'This is my body.' The first passage according to the Roman interpretation justified the Papacy, the second Mariolatry, the third, Transubstantiation. Because they held these doctrines to be false, five of our English bishops including our Primate were burnt at the stake, and a number of our English clergy died a similar death. There is no indication to-day that the Roman Church has departed in the smallest degree from that position. It is useless therefore to discuss the prospects of reunion with Rome unless the English Church is willing to re-consider its Reformation attitude. Now whilst it is clear that a number of the Anglican clergy have been dis-

posed to do so, and a smaller number of the Anglican laity, there is no prospect that the bulk of the English nation will ever follow their example. Modern knowledge absolutely discredits the Roman claims. Modern New Testament criticism is very doubtful whether our Lord ever uttered the *Tu es Petrus*, but modern New Testament exegesis is not at all doubtful that even if the words were uttered by Him they give no authority whatsoever to Papal claims. The historian sees multitudes of reasons political, geographical, ecclesiastical, why the Papacy should have arisen, but he finds no valid reason for the Papacy in the teaching of Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church.

Is it then worth while for the Church of England to seek reunion with the Church of Rome? If such a reunion were achieved, would it be worth anything from the point of view of the extension of the influence of the Gospel in the modern world? It could only mean that fewer English people would be influenced by the Church than is at present the case, and that anti-clericalism and secularism in this land would receive a great and undesirable access of strength. It would also mean that any possibility of reunion with Free Churchmen would be rendered indefinitely remote. We recognise the Primate's authority, in view of the 1920 Lambeth Conference Appeal, to admit discussions of their differences by Anglicans and Romanists, although an obviously futile proceeding in view of the unyielding adhesion of Romanists to their system.

Nevertheless the knowledge by the public that such discussions are taking place is extraordinarily detrimental to the prestige of the English Church, because whilst no one doubts that Rome will yield nothing, there is a feeling abroad that the surrender may be on the English side. During the last seventy years the English Church has exhibited only too much evidence of yielding to Roman influence to be able to enter on conferences like that at Malines without being suspected of wavering in loyalty to the Reformation Settlement. This not only perturbs her more strongly Protestant members, but weakens the possibility of reunion with Free Churchmen and Presbyterians. Yet these seem to us the lesser evils. The Romeward movement of Anglicans means a movement away from modern thought and modern knowledge, and that means

an increasing inability on the part of the Church to retain its present members and also an increasing inability to win 'the unchurched masses.'

The difference between the Roman and Anglican representatives at Malines seems to an increasing number of English people to-day to be on a par with the difference 'twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Their verdict is that of Heine's princess on the difference between Jew and Saracen: *sie stinken beide*: and they pass contemptuously on their way—it may be to Gehenna, but if that be so, it is the fault of a Church which concerns itself with efforts to get into touch with the mediaeval mind and to re-mould itself accordingly, rather than to understand the modern mind, and whilst itself loyal to the Spirit of Christ to address that mind in such a way as to win its assent. We hope therefore for the sake of our Evangelical members, for the sake of our future relations with Free Churchmen, and, above all, for the sake of the effective development of the English Church itself, that the Malines conferences will be terminated decisively as soon as possible.

Evangelical *malaise* is not perhaps serious, nevertheless there ought to be an economy in the enjoyment of it; Free Church suspicion in view of the advent of a Labour or Liberal Government may be even more detrimental in other directions than those which have re-union in view; but the most fatal of all policies would be that which deflects the trend of Anglican thought and interest Romewards in view of the steady movement of modern thought away from Rome. If the English Church turns back from the attempt to understand the modern mind and to Christianize it she is doomed, and the Romeward movement of Anglicanism to-day is steadily producing in her this creeping paralysis. We must not write 'What concord hath Christ with Belial?' but 'What concord has freedom with tyranny, and what part has he that believes in the scientific method of the search for truth with him that despises or fears it?'

Mr. Warre Cornish in his *History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century* writes:—

> 'The advance, whether in truth or error, which has been made during the last century is due to the historical and comparative method of discovering facts in textual, biblical, and historical science. This

movement necessarily came in with the study of physical science and the development of the comparative method. Broad Churchmen and Latitudinarians are those who in every age accept scientific conclusions and endeavour to adapt traditional beliefs to them. Coleridge and Maurice believed themselves to be orthodox and conservative; Milman and Pattison knew that limits could not be set to inquiry, and believed that their duty was to look forward, not back. Such thinkers approach problems of faith from different points of view and in a different spirit; but their paths converge, and the upholder of biblical and ecclesiastical authority instinctively knows them for his enemies.' (Vol. I, p. 187.)

In such a case there is no union possible between corporations whose psychology is radically different, and even to discuss it must seem to plain persons either solemn trifling or secret treason. Co-operation in philanthropic and social endeavour between Anglicans and Romanists is desirable and commendable, but the re-union of the English Church with an unreformed Rome would terminate the not inglorious history of the English Church and render the bulk of the English nation indifferent if not bitterly hostile to organized Christianity.

Anti-Modernism in America.

The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church meeting at Dallas, Texas, adopted on November 14th the following Resolution:

We are aware of the widespread distress and disturbance of mind among many earnest church people, both clerical and lay, caused by several utterances concerning the Creeds. Moreover, we have been appealed to by eminent laymen as the Chief Pastors of the Church, solemnly pledged to uphold its Faith, for advice and guidance with regard to the questions thus raised. We, therefore, put forth these words of explanation and, we trust, of reassurance.

1. A distinction is to be recognized (as in the Catechism) between the profession of our belief in (*i.e.* of the entire surrender to) the Triune God, and the declaration that we believe certain facts about the operation of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. The former is far more important as expressing our relation and attitude towards the Personal God. But the affirmation of the facts, declared by Holy Scripture and a part of the belief of the Christian Church from the beginning, is of vital importance to faith and life. The Christian Faith may be distinguished from the forms in which it is expressed as something deeper and higher and more personal, but not by contradicting the terms in which it has always been expressed.

2. The Creeds give and require no theories, nor explanations of the facts which they rehearse. No explanation is given of the Trinity, how God is at the same time absolutely One in His Spiritual Being and yet exists in a threefold manner; nor concerning the Incarnation, nor the manner in which the divine and human natures are linked together in the One Person of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor of the nature of the Resurrection Body, Christ's or ours.

3. The shorter Creed is to be interpreted in the light of the fuller Nicene Creed. The more elaborate statements of the latter safeguard the sense in which the simpler language of the former is to be understood, for instance, with reference to the term: 'The Son of God.'

4. Some test of the earnest and sincere purpose of discipleship, for belief and for life, is reasonably required for admission to the Christian society. Accordingly, profession of the Apostles' Creed as a summary of Christian belief stands and has stood from early days along with renunciation of evil and the promise of obedience to God's Commandments as a condition of baptism.

5. A clergyman, whether deacon, priest or bishop, is required as a condition of receiving his ministerial commission to promise conformity to the doctrine, discipline and worship of this Church. Among the offences for which he is liable to be presented for trial is the holding and teaching publicly, or privately and advisedly, doctrine contrary to that of this Church. Individual aberrations, in teaching or practice, however regrettable or censurable, cannot be taken to supersede the deliberate and written standards of the Church. It is irreconcilable with the vows voluntarily made at ordination for a minister of this Church to deny, or to suggest doubt as to the facts and truths declared in the Apostles' Creed.

6. To deny, or to treat as immaterial belief in the Creeds, in what at every regular service of the Church both minister and congregation profess to believe, is to trifle with words and cannot but expose us to the suspicion and the danger of dishonesty and unreality. Honesty in the use of language—to say what we mean and mean what we say—is not least important with regard to religious language and especially in our approach to Almighty God, however imperfect to express divine realities we may recognize human words to be. To explain away the statement 'Conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary' as if it referred to a birth in the ordinary way of two human parents under, perhaps, exceptionally holy conditions is plainly an abuse of language. An ordinary birth could not have been so described, nor can the words of the Creed fairly be so understood.

7. Objections to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, or to the bodily resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ are not only contrary to the Christian tradition, but have been abundantly dealt with by the best scholarship of the day.

8. It is not the fact of the Virgin Birth that makes us believe in our Lord as God; but our belief in Him as God makes reasonable and natural our acceptance of the fact of the Virgin Birth as declared in the Scriptures and as confessed in the Creed from the earliest times.

9. The Creed witnesses to the deliberate and determined purpose not to explain but to proclaim the fact that the Jesus of history is none other than God and Saviour on Whom and on faith in Whom depends the whole world's hope of redemption and salvation.

10. So far from imposing fetters on our thought, the Creeds with their simple statements of great truths and facts without elaborate philosophical disquisition give us a point of departure for free thought and speculation on the meaning and consequences of the facts revealed by God. The truth is never a barrier to thought: in belief and in life it is the truth that sets us free.

Arthur C. A. Hall, *Chairman.*
Thomas F. Gailor,
Joseph B. Cheshire.
Reginald H. Weller.
William T. Manning.

This Resolution in the form of a Pastoral Letter the bishops ordered to be read by all the clergy from their pulpits on any Sunday within thirty days from its receipt. It required no large measure of foresight to perceive that such action was bound to create a situation of acute strain between Traditionalists and Modernists. We have no doubt the promoters of the Resolution desired to create a crisis: they believed that they had enough support behind them to crush the Modernists. Like the noble Tyrconnell the motto inscribed on their banner is, 'Now or never: Now for ever.' 'Weak men,' wrote John Milton, 'are for hastening things,' and it is equally true of causes that are weakening. If the Traditionalist leaders do not act now, they will never be in a position to act at all.

Bishop Lawrence's allocution demanded a counterblast. The counterblast has come. What effect has it produced? The Rev. L. W. Heaton, rector of Holy Trinity Church, Fort Worth, Texas, has been presented for trial for heresy, for declaring in a sermon that the Virgin Birth is not an essential article of the Christian Faith, his bishop having forewarned him that he stands as much chance of escape 'as a snowflake in hell.' The Rev. Dr. Leighton Parks, rector of St. Bartholomew's, New York, and one of the most influential of the New York clergy, has publicly from his pulpit condemned the episcopal action, and has challenged his bishop, Dr. Manning, to prosecute Dr. Lawrence or himself for heresy, affirming that his teaching was identical with that of Mr. Heaton. This action of Dr. Leighton Parks seems to us not only courageous but judicious. It transfers the conflict from the 'wild and woolly west,' where we may assume Fundamentalism is strongest, into the heart of the East where Modernism has more support in Church circles. Moreover, instead of prosecuting a young and unknown man, the authorities are challenged to prosecute one whose work as the leader of a great institutional church is known and honoured.

The situation created by the bishops who supported the Resolution is not therefore one with which they will find it easy to cope. Either Dr. Manning must prosecute Dr. Leighton Parks or he stultifies his signature attached to the Resolution. If he prosecutes and fails, the Traditionalist cause is dis-

credited: if he prosecutes and succeeds he condemns the head of the most influential and generous of New York congregations, and with disastrous results to the Church work in this diocese. The late Bishop Boyd Carpenter feared as the greatest evil which could befall the Church 'the advent of an ignorant and fanatical episcopate.' Thanks to the wisdom of our Prime Ministers the English episcopate possesses a sufficient leaven of sanity, sound learning, and patient statesmanship not to run the Ship of the Church on to the rocks in this fashion. A time of great mental and moral strain is not the time to attempt that which the American episcopate has rashly adventured, driven headlong by some pestilential wind blowing out of the Œcumenical Council chambers of the fifth century.

The Modernist Defence.

The American Modern Churchmen (of whose organization we give an account in another article) have not—we express ourselves in the phrase of the judicious Hooker—'basely through silence allowed things to pass away as in a dream.' On December 10th, at a meeting of their members held in Boston, they adopted the following 'Statement concerning the Bishops' Pastoral Letter.'

The House of Bishops, sixty-five bishops being present out of about one hundred and forty, has just issued a Pastoral Letter of reassurance to earnest people of our Church who have been distressed in mind by several recent utterances concerning the Creed. Gladly recognizing the sincere purpose of the bishops to give advice with regard to the questions thus raised, we deeply regret that in the execution of their purpose they themselves have caused widespread distress and disturbance of mind among many earnest people of our Church, both clerical and lay.

This Letter is not an authoritative utterance, decisive of the limits of liberty permissible in the interpretation of the Creeds, for under the Constitution of the Church no such power is committed to the House of Bishops. It should be recognized, therefore, that their opinions are not canonically binding upon clergy or laity. Yet the responsibility and the right to express our regretful but conscientious dissent from some of these opinions we feel bound to exercise in defence of a liberty of interpretation which the Letter refuses, and on behalf of the many bishops, presbyters and laymen who feel that their honesty, loyalty and right to membership in the Church have been unjustly denied.

In loyalty to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this Church, we affirm:

(1) That in view of the recognition by these Bishops that belief in God, in the sense of entire surrender to Him, is far more important to God and his Church than the declaration that we believe certain facts, we regret that at this time when great issues are confronting the world, the Letter

should be chiefly concerned with denying membership in our Church to those who are unable to affirm a belief in certain clauses in the Creed taken as literal statements of fact.

(2) That we believe that God was incarnate in Jesus Christ. But disagreement among the best scholars of the day as to the source and reliability of the evidence for the Virgin Birth is well known; the recognition by conservative New Testament scholars that belief in the Virgin Birth was not a part of the belief of the Church in the first generation is growing; and leading conservative theologians have recently stated that belief in the Virgin Birth is not essential to belief in the Incarnation. In his ordination vow every clergyman of our Church engages to teach nothing as necessary to salvation but that which he is persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture. Where two divergent traditions are contained in the canonical books of the New Testament, it is incumbent upon the believer to accept that tradition which appears to him to have the greater weight of evidence. We are therefore convinced that the bishops have done a grievous injustice to the loyalty and honesty of those clergy and laity who are unable to affirm a belief in the Virgin Birth.

(3) That we can see no reason for allowing a non-literal interpretation of certain clauses in the Creed, such as: 'He descended into Hell,' and 'He ascended into Heaven,' and 'the resurrection of the body,' while denying the right to such interpretation in the clause concerning the Virgin Birth. The best scholarship of the day has abundantly shown that to the writers of the New Testament and in the mind of the early Church all these were equally literal statements of fact. We venture to believe that most members of the Church, including most of the bishops, are unable to affirm a literal belief in one or more of the facts stated in these clauses, and we protest against the denial of a similar liberty in the case of the other clauses.

(4) That we recognize that 'honesty in the use of language—to say what we mean and mean what we say—is not least important with regard to religious language and especially in our approach to Almighty God.' The necessary process of interpretation in the use of ancient forms, and especially of ancient statements of belief such as the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds is obviously fraught with difficulty and seems to an increasing number clearly to 'expose us to the suspicion and the danger of dishonesty and unreality.' We cannot be permanently satisfied with such a situation, and we therefore feel that the time has come for our Church to consider seriously both the place of the Creeds in public worship, and the adoption in the office of Baptism of a simpler statement of faith as a condition of membership in the Church.

This statement seems to us to be marked by acumen and firmness. It is non-provocative in tone and unanswerable in reasoning, and cannot but affect the situation favourably. We congratulate our Modernist brethren in America on the wisdom and promptness which have marked the opening movements in their campaign on behalf of truth and freedom. Doubtless like all good men they are lovers of peace, but peace with dishonour, peace with enslavement, is not the peace which men of goodwill ought to maintain. Such a peace is certainly not that 'peace of God which passeth all understanding.' We wish

them victory. We express this aspiration moved by no desire for a personal triumph. Men are but as shadows; the causes for which they contend abide. The cause for which the American Modernists contend, as do we, is that belief in the great fundamentals of the Christian Faith ought to be the only belief required of the Christian teacher. In all non-essentials he ought to be free, and in no case ought he to be required to affirm belief in things which the advance of knowledge has shown to be either doubtful or fictitious. In England the struggle has been a long one, but we are slowly reaching the goal of liberation. In America, when they move, at least so we read their history, they move much faster than we do, so it may well be that they will attain the goal and fulfil those lines of the great poet of theological liberalism before we in England can rejoice in a like achievement.

> 'And not by eastern windows only,
> When daylight comes, comes in the light;
> In front the sun climbs slow, how slowly!
> But westward, look, the land is bright.'

The Modern Churchmen's Union in America.

The important part, which it has fallen to American Modernists to play, may well lead to enquiries as to their principles and organisation: we therefore publish the following particulars.

The Modern Churchmen's Union of America was brought into existence less than three years ago. It adopted as its model the Churchmen's Union in this country and circulates the *Modern Churchman* as its organ. Its principles, which are in substance the same as those of the Churchmen's Union, are set forth as follows.

Principles.

Believing that Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, it is our purpose:—

1. To affirm the continuous activity of the Holy Spirit in all spheres of life and thought.
2. To maintain the right to interpret the historic expressions of our Faith in accordance with the results of modern science and of biblical and historical scholarship.
3. To advance, as an aid to the ultimate reunion of Christendom, co-operation and fellowship between the Protestant Episcopal Church and all other Christian Churches.

4. To bring the Gospel to the unchurched classes of our population, in order to win their allegiance to the religious and moral demands of the Kingdom of God.
5. To further the application of the principles of Christ in all industrial, social and international relations.
6. To encourage greater freedom and elasticity in the worship of the Church, in order to adapt it to the need and thought of the times.
7. To emphasize afresh the nature of the Christian life as personal fellowship with God, and to study with sympathy those movements and tendencies of thought which are mystical in character.

It should be clearly understood that the Union is not a partisan organization, and that it has no interest in ecclesiastical politics. The cleavage between liberal thought and so-called fundamentalism is not vertical, but horizontal. The union opposes only that obscurantism which is to be found in all parties in the Church. Yet its methods will be constructive rather than controversial. It will strive to promote the Catholic conception of comprehension, and not the sectarian idea of exclusion. It will try to speak the truth in love. It believes that the Truth will prevail, and that it needs no legal enactments to prove or enforce it.

It feels justified, therefore, in calling upon all in our Church who are like-minded to join it and help the cause of reverent and fearless study, and the free and fearless announcement of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, claiming the liberty which our Church allows, the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.

The membership of the Union was recently stated to comprise over five hundred clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and we are glad to note that its organisation is in good working order. The following is its latest list of officers.

President, the Rev. Elwood Worcester, Ph.D., D.D.; *Vice-President,* the Rev. Stuart L. Tyson, D.D.; *Corresponding Secretary,* the Rev. C. M. Addison, D.D.; *Recording Secretary,* the Rev. H. N. Arrowsmith; *Treasurer,* George Foster Peabody, Esq.; *Assistant Treasurer,* the Rev. H. W. Hobson; and the Revs. Samuel McComb, D.D., Philemon F. Sturges, D.D., H. K. Sherill, and A. G. Cummins, Litt.D., D.D.

Honorary Vice-Presidents: The Rt. Rev. J. W. Atwood, D.D., Arizona; the Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, D.D., California; the Rt. Rev. Logan H. Roots, D.D., Hankow; the Rev. J. A. Leighton, LL.D., Columbus, Ohio; the Rev. L. W. Batten, D.D., New York, N.Y.; the Hon. Joseph Packard, LL.D., Baltimore, Md.; and the Hon. Roland S. Morris, LL.D., Philadelphia, Penn.

Editorial Board: Rev. S. McComb, Rev. E. S. Brown, Rev. E. Worcester, Rev. F. Palmer.

Conference Committee: Rev. J. H. Melish, Rev. H. P. Nichols, Rev. P. G. Kammerer.

Finance Committee: Rev. Hugh Birckhead, George Foster Peabody, Esq.

Advisory Council: R. C. Smith, D.D., E. Worcester, Ph.D., D.D., S. L. Tyson. D.D., C. M. Addison, D.D., H. N. Arrowsmith, George Foster Peabody, Esq., H. W. Hobson, S. McComb, D.D., Philemon Sturges, D.D., H. K. Sherrill, A. G. Cummins, Litt.D., D.D., E. Peabody, D.D., LL.D., F. Palmer, D.D., J. H. Melish, H. P. Nichols, D.D.

P. G. Kammerer, Ph.D., E. S. Drown, D.D., H. Birckhead, D.D., C. M. Douglas, W. R. Bowie, D.D., Frank H. Nelson, D.D., Carl Grammer, D.D., N. B. Nash, J. W. Suter, D.D., C. B. Wilmer, D.D., J. T. Dallas, D.D., S. Tyler, D.D., Robert Johnston, D.D., D.C.L., &c., &c.

We hope that Liberal Churchmen in America will recognise the importance in the present crisis of giving wholehearted and immediate support to the Union. The weakness of ecclesiastical and theological liberalism is its contempt of organization. That is why causes less deserving of success prevail to the detriment of the Church.

Revision of the Liturgy.

The House of Clergy at the recent session of the Church Assembly came to an agreement to adopt the two following alternative forms for the most important part of the Communion Service known to liturgiologists as the Canon. These forms are known, respectively, as 'orange' and 'grey.'

(1) The 'Orange' Canon:

All glory and thanksgiving be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption: who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ.

Who in the same night that he was betrayed took Bread and when he had given thanks he brake it and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here, before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching

thee to grant that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his Blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto thee: humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

Let us pray.

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us we are bold to say: Our Father, &c.

(2) The 'Grey' Canon:

All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to take our nature upon him and to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; Who made there by his one offering of himself, once offered, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; and did institute and in his holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of himself, wherein we do proclaim his death until his coming again.

Who in the same night that he was betrayed took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious Death of thy dear Son, his mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable blessings which he hath assured to us. And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant that by the merits and death of thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church, offering ourselves to thee in communion with him, may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of his Passion.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit bless and sanctify both us and these ¶ thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: By whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

As our Saviour Christ hath taught us, we are bold to say:—

[*Here the People shall join with the Priest in saying the Lord's Prayer.*]

In the 'grey' Canon Liberals will be glad to note the omission of 'satisfaction' used of the death of Christ, but such a statement as 'did institute and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of Himself, wherein we do proclaim His death until His coming again,' is far from satisfactory. The Gospels of St. Mark, St. Matthew, and St. John do not contain any command by Christ to keep the Eucharist in perpetual memory of Himself, and Dr. Sanday indicated clearly that the textual evidence is against 'This do in remembrance,' &c., being part of St. Luke's Gospel. We get the command to perpetuate the Eucharist not from the Gospels, but from St. Paul (I *Cor.* xi, 24). Therefore in the light of modern criticism it is not desirable to include in a revised Consecration Prayer the statement, 'did institute and in His holy Gospel command us to continue,' &c. Moreover, 'until his coming again' is in the light of our eschatological controversies better omitted. It is tolerable to use an ancient prayer containing these statements, but it is intolerable to use a modern prayer containing them.

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF BISHOP LAWRENCE

By the Editor.

BROTHER Lawrence, the mystic, never so far as we know became a bishop, least of all a bishop in America. If we recollect rightly he remained the general factotum of his monastery, and as he was a really useful person where he was, no one was foolish enough to think of transferring him to any other post. His authorities very properly felt that his promotion was best postponed until the resurrection of the just. Hence it will be understood at the outset that the Bishop Lawrence, with whom this article deals, is quite another person. He has been Bishop of Massachusetts for thirty years, and on the thirtieth anniversary of his consecration, October 5th, 1923, in response to a loyal address from his diocese, delivered in his cathedral an allocution embracing a retrospect of fifty years of his minis-

terial life. This retrospect has just been published,[1] and published at a critical time in America, for the allocution is in substance a biographical apology for Modernism as against Fundamentalism and Traditionalism. An opening paragraph strikes the key-note of what follows :—

> 'My boyhood was passed in a large and happy family which, through the beautiful character of my parents, daily family prayer, and Sunday worship, was saturated with Christian piety. Attending the public schools, the Town Meetings, and the rallies in the Civil War, I was filled with the spirit of American Democracy. I went through Harvard University, whose mottoes are "The Truth" and "For Christ and His Church." Knowing personally through my father's friends some of the leaders of New England's thought, literature, and religion, I was brought up to face changes of thought and faith with an open mind and with courage. As I started from my home for the Theological Seminary, timid, humble, driven by a sense of duty and loyalty to Christ, President Hopkins, of Williams College, the great educator and Christian philosopher of his day, who was a guest of my father, said good-bye to me, adding, "You think that you have settled some questions; but you will have to begin all over again." What he meant I could not then understand; but a few weeks revealed his meaning, and now, half a century later, some of the questions are still unsettled.'

The future bishop at this time held all the traditional views current in orthodox circles, but a change was imminent.

> 'When a Junior at Harvard I went one day to a lecture by Professor Agassiz on the glacial theory which was arousing keen popular interest. Doubts had entered my mind as to the accuracy of the account of the creation of the world in six days. Defenders of the Faith had already begun to concede that six days were six æons; that possibly the serpent himself did not talk with Eve—most unsatisfactory concessions, they seemed to me. Nevertheless, the date 4004 still stood in the margin of the Bible, and six days were six days. Think, then, of the shock given when Agassiz, of charming personality, and in broken English, said, "Gentlemen, the world is older than we have been taught to think. Its age is as if one were gently to rub a silk handkerchief across Plymouth Rock once a year until it were reduced to a pebble.'
>
> 'I left that lecture thinking hard as to how the discoveries of science might destroy or perhaps glorify our faith in God and the revelation of Him in the Scriptures, and have been thinking ever since. I had suspected and silently decided that the Bible was wrong somehow. But if one yielded to science in the Biblical account of creation, which of course was an historical fact, where was one going to stop?'
>
> 'When, therefore, I began seriously to study for the ministry, I discovered what President Hopkins meant. Problems, questions, doubts, ever-revealing truth wrestled with each other in mortal combat.

[1] *Fifty Years,* by William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D. (Houghton Mifflin, Boston and New York, 1923; 97 pp.; price 50 cents.)

The publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species," which marks the new era, was in 1859, fourteen years before my date of 1873. The subject of a thesis given me by my professor in Theology was, "Can a man believe in Darwinism and remain a Christian?' The professor said he could not. I knew almost nothing on the subject, though I had, of course, read the "Origin of Species." But the marshalling of facts, the evident honesty of purpose and the humility of Darwin threw me over to his side. And when the war between science and religion, so full of tragedy and comedy, was on, I found myself in general sympathy with the standpoint of science.

'One day I passed across the hall from the lecture room of my conservative theological professor, who spent his time defending his conception of the Faith by quoting proof texts taken from Old Testament and New Testament, with little regard for their historic setting, to the room of a young professor who had caught the spirit of the modern Christian scholar, and who, when faced with a critical question, said, "Gentlemen, it is not for me to defend the Faith. A true faith will defend itself. It is my duty to guide you with open mind, humble spirit, and pure heart to the Truth, the Truth alone, wherever it may lead you; and be ye sure that it will always lead you to a fuller knowledge of Christ, who is the Truth. Hold as for your life to that attitude of mind. Seek the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free." From that hour I have been free: not free from questions, problems, troubles, and doubts, but at the very foundation of my faith confident, serene, and free.

'The theories of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, and of the inspiration of every word, received their fatal blow in the sixties and seventies, though thousands on thousands of the faithful know it not at this day. I can still hear the tone of a strong preacher ring out with the sound of an alarm, "If I could not believe that Joshua made the sun stand still in the heavens, I should lose faith in the Bible and in God." Just as real to me, too, are the echoes of sad voices of faithful men and women bewailing the fact that their rector had said that perhaps the incidents in the story of the Garden of Eden, of Adam, Eve, and the serpent, were not historic facts. For hard upon the heels of the iconoclasts created by discoveries of science came the even more dangerous literary critics. How well I remember the first time that I read the sentence of Coleridge, that the test of the inspiration of the Scriptures is the way in which they "find you, the way in which they touch your moral and spiritual nature"; and the dictum of Jowett, "Interpret the Bible as any other book"—phrases which seemed to give the death-stroke to much that I held dear. Rightly understood, however, they were the Magna Charta of modern Biblical criticism. "Essays and Reviews," published in 1861, caused a deep sensation. The first essay by young Frederick Temple, entitled "The Education of the World," placed the Old Testament upon an historic basis and overthrew the popular, orthodox conception of the sacred books. Bishop Wilberforce, of Oxford, at the time the most eloquent preacher and leader of the Church of England, solemnly demanded that all the essayists be compelled to withdraw from the ministry. It is suggestive of the quick changes of the times that the same Temple became Archbishop of Canterbury.

'There gradually emerged, however, a sense of confidence that spiritual truths were forging to the front, that the Old Testament had higher purposes than that of teaching science and showing forth

miracles. The patriarchs, men of their own generation, though touched with the frailties of human nature, became to us real men, men inspired by God; the Psalms, whether David or others wrote them, were sung for their own sake; the prophets were statesmen of their day, setting forth in the language of their time the principles of righteousness and anticipating nobler times to come.

'Just as we were settling our minds to appreciate and rejoice in these revelations, the critic moved from the Old Testament to the New. In these books and epistles we had or thought we had facts, stated in terms of comparatively modern history. But here again traditions, beliefs, and beloved narratives were questioned or denied. The recognition of the orderly working of nature weakened confidence in the miraculous, and as years passed theologians and exegetical scholars, esteemed conservative and orthodox, interpreted scenes, teachings, and epistles in a way that would have astounded themselves ten years before.'

Undoubtedly William Lawrence was greatly helped in these critical years by the preaching and personal friendship of Phillips Brooks. Under his magnetic eloquence false views however venerable were replaced by true ones. Yet many of the bishop's contemporaries were not so fortunate. Looking back over his half century he writes :—

'Great numbers of young people were lost to the Church and the Faith by the inability of many teachers and preachers to adjust their vision to the fuller light. The fault was not altogether theirs, for it is our duty in proving all things to hold fast that which is good; and it was very difficult then to discriminate which was the good.'

All this led the bishop to put to himself a very important question and to answer it honestly. The question was this: How is it possible for me to live in the free air of the search for truth, meet the intellectual changes as they come, and yet remain a loyal member of the Church in which I have been brought up and of which I am a minister?

There were, so it seemed to him, four possible alternatives, and it is worth while to give them at some length.

'1. Why should I not retain my freedom to think and search for the truth in a creedless church? Unhampered by forms of words, at liberty to express my faith and all its changes from day to day, I could live in intellectual honesty, and sincerely believe and speak what I believed. For one reason: I have not been able to find any creedless church, if by creed we mean a form of expression of the faith that is in us. Whenever a conference of what is supposed to be such a church is held, the members always have some common standing ground of faith, even if it be only the creed that "right is right"; or that, "If there be a God, that God is love." Both these creeds, any creeds, are a limitation on one's complete liberty of thought and search for truth. My problem was, therefore, not to find a conviction-

less and creedless church, but to find one sufficiently so to satisfy my desire for liberty. Edward Everett Hale once told me that churches should make new creeds every year as birds build their nests. I did not happen to find any church of that sort; and if I had, I question how long the church would hold together, or what practical or charitable work it could do, if the members discussed throughout the year the manufacture of a new creed. In fact, such a church must of itself disintegrate into "individualism." And pure individualism does not bring freedom, but isolation and bondage to ourselves, our moods and habits of thought.

'2. At the other extreme were churches which had buttressed their faith with long creeds and catechisms, entering into and binding the details of religious thought and life. The members of these churches were consciously bound together by a covenant, and if any one deliberately broke the covenant, he in all honor must retire. This attitude has strength up to a certain point, and efficiency. If a member, be he ever so pure a saint, believes that Joshua did not make the sun stand still, or that Isaiah did not write the Book of Isaiah, he must retire or be excommunicated. Is the Christian Church, then composed only of those who agree to think exactly alike? What, then, is to become of the great mass of Christians who do not think alike? Have we not here a sect of Christian people, a private club composed of a group who call themselves a Christian Church? There are, however, churches which have done away with these elaborate creeds and catechisms, as archaic and inexpressive of modern faith, and have formed new and simpler creeds, some of them very beautiful and expressive. I sympathize deeply with such efforts, and yet I find that, as the years go on, even these creeds are subject to changes to meet later thought and sometimes to radical revision. Their creation is founded on the presumption that a creed should be closely or literally interpreted, as was the case with the elaborate creeds which were discarded; and so long as the theory of literal interpretation holds, the creeds must be continually changing with changing thought, involving perpetual discussion on the terms of faith, a tendency to individualism, and the loss of a sense of corporate unity which is an essential of strength in the Christian Church.

'3. The third alternative was that from which our fathers in the Reformation revolted, submission to the Church of Rome. Born and bred as I was an American, in the liberty of thought which is our heritage, I could not find that liberty in submission to a Church which, however noble in many features, is founded on the principle of autocracy, not democracy, and which has in countries where it has been dominant suppressed liberty of thought; a Church which, though world-wide in its organization, is governed by foreign influences and a foreign ruler; a Church which has as its essentials of the Faith certain dogmas which I believe are not in harmony with the teachings of the Scripture.

'4. The fourth alternative I took, that of remaining in the Church of my birth. In making this decision, I was led to a fresh study of the Church, and learned more intimately than before some of its salient features. It is an historic Church, with liturgy, ministry, and creeds reaching back to the beginnings of Christianity; and, because historic, has not only those elements of faith which have weathered the storms of centuries, but which have been continually open to readjustments and fresh interpretations.'

The upshot was that William Lawrence, finding himself after much examination generally loyal to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, resolved to lay all further curious questioning aside and live and work as a free man in a communion which is itself essentially free and comprehensive. It is true that he found himself unable to interpret a number of the clauses in the Creeds literally—we refer here to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the American Church eliminated the *Quicunque Vult* long ago—but this did not trouble him. In 1884 he heard the learned Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, in Westminster Abbey, condemn cremation on the ground that it would weaken faith in the resurrection of the body, so on returning to America he became a vice-president of a cremation society with the object of preventing traditionalist interpretations of the creed from proving a stumbling block to men of modern mind.

His remarks about the Virgin Birth clause are of interest in view of present controversies in America. We hope they are done with in this country. The bishop writes :—

> 'It is now well recognized that scholars are divided upon the question of the Virgin Birth, as to whether the stronger evidence leads to the confirmation of this as a fact, or whether it is a tradition which must be re-examined. These scholars are not mere critics and sceptics, but are upon either side men of equal reverence, faith, and belief in the Incarnation. With the conservatism of my nature, I have always acceded to the tradition, but with a mind open to further light. Some thirty years ago, however, I was convinced that there is no essential connection between the belief in the Virgin Birth and a belief in the Incarnation. In giving expression to that conviction, which was founded on the careful study of a few American scholars, I was charged by friends dear to me with heresy. It is now a source of satisfaction to read in Bishop Gore's later works wherein he is defending the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, that he has come to the same conclusion. There are, as we well know, clergymen, a number of them, who find it difficult, if not impossible, to accept the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, whose belief in the Incarnation is sincere and firm; indeed, whose belief has been made the firmer by their release from this doctrine. Their reasons are to them convincing; and inasmuch as the two Creeds stand for the essentials of the Faith, and as belief in the Virgin Birth is not to them an essential, I am clear that with an honest heart they may join in the recital of the Creeds. I well know that this position may bring sorrow to those whose faith in the Incarnation, whose habits of thought and worship have been interwoven with the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. But their interpretation of the Creeds and their comfort in them are in no way affected by the different interpretations of others.'

The bishop asserts that since he became a bishop he has never asked his candidates for Orders their position on that point. We could wish that all English bishops had the wisdom to follow his example. At the Deacon's Examination in the London Diocese this Advent the following question was set and all candidates were required to answer it.

> 'How would you defend the miraculous element in Christianity? Illustrate your answer by reference to the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb.'

Some may ask what does the recitation of the Creeds mean to this bishop, and how can he recite them conscientiously? We give the reply in his own words.

> 'We proclaim in words endeared by association, hallowed by the ages, our loyalty to God the Father, his Son, and the Holy Spirit. We cannot define the Triune God. We understand but little; but we do each and all stand for and depend upon our Heavenly Father, the loving Saviour, and the Eternal Spirit of Truth. Believing this, we may all join in the ancient Creeds of the Church.'

The bishop thinks many Church people are disposed to over-emphasize the importance of reciting the Creeds. He writes:—

> 'It seems to be assumed by some good people that unless the Creed is recited, the service has no backbone of belief; and if anyone criticizes the form or phraseology of one of the ancient Creeds, it is assumed that he is weak in the Faith. The fact is that his criticism may spring from a living faith which is restive under necessarily imperfect expression; it is not the Faith that is inadequate, but the form of expression of the Faith.'

What the bishop desires especially is moral and spiritual sensitiveness with regard to the demands of the Faith. He says:—

> 'When, therefore, we recite the Creed, our first care is not as to whether we believe each article according to the early interpretation, whether we are orthodox in our beliefs, but whether we express in our lives the beliefs that we speak' . . .
>
> 'It is at this point the lack of that emphasis as compared with that of dogmatic statement and ecclesiastical requirements that turns many a high-minded man and woman from the Church. Abraham Lincoln, the typical American, is reported to have said, 'When any church will inscribe over its altar as its sole qualification of membership the Saviour's condensed statement of both law and gospel, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself," that church will I join with all my heart and with all my soul.'

The bishop believes that there is serious danger in using the Apostles' Creed in the Baptismal Service in any rigid doc-

trinal sense. We feel ourselves to be in hearty accord with the following statement :—

> 'In the reception of the child or adult into the Church at baptism, this Creed is the doctrinal test, "Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?" If this is to be interpreted in the free way in which I have already suggested that the Creeds should be interpreted, as the free expression of faith in Christ, very good. But if this promise involves the acceptance of all the articles of the Creed in their literal sense, I ask, as I asked in the House of Bishops at the General Convention a year ago, "What right has any branch of the Catholic Church to set up a bar of entrance to the Church which is higher than that used by the Apostles themselves?" And it was with great gratification that I heard the beloved and conservative Bishop of Southern Ohio rise and formally offer as an amendment to the present Baptismal Office the expression, "I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God." The amendment was voted down, but the Bishop turned to me, saying, "We have started a movement which will continue after we have gone."'

Yet, it must not be supposed that Bishop Lawrence is a sort of episcopal fire-brand. One who has reached the age of seventy-three and has been a bishop for thirty years is not likely to suffer from indiscreet impetuosity. His long episcopate has been marked by extreme caution. He writes correctly of himself.

> 'By inheritance and temper I am a conservative. Taken off my guard, I should like to have things stay as they are. It is so comfortable to have habits of thought and life, principles and beliefs, that never alter. I should so enjoy life if I were always orthodox.'

Yet he knows that for one who is a truth-seeker and who would be a truth-teacher there is no sitting still. It is true that the Christian Religion is above all a life—a life lived in communion with God and in fellowship with man, nevertheless the Christian teacher living in a modern community seems bound to be faced with constant problems. The bishop writes :—

> 'A short time ago a friend said to me, with something of a sigh "Is this movement of thought, this fight for the Faith, this meeting of problems, going to keep on? Has not the last half-century fought most of the questions through to a finish?"'

And the bishop's reply is in the spirit of the distich :

> 'Does the road run uphill all the way?
> Yes, to the very end.
> Does the journey last the livelong day?
> From dawn to dark, my friend.'

> 'The future as I see it,' he writes, 'is going to bring to the Church fresh problems and battles, intellectual and spiritual, and, if we hold steadfast to the Spirit of Truth, victories also, which will be equal to any in the past.'

MONSIGNOR LOUIS DUCHESNE

By Professor Percy Gardner, D.Litt., F.B.A.

THE Roman Church in France has produced in the last century three scholars of great eminence in Christian history, Renan, Loisy and Duchesne. Their careers have much in common, though the third, unlike the first two, remained in the Roman communion. All alike had an intense love for the Church as an institution, which they never lost, but in the life of all alike there was a long and painful conflict between the Roman spirit and the spirit of scientific history.

As to Renan, I do not propose to say anything. Everyone with a literary taste must have read his *Souvenirs*, one of the most beautiful of books. M. Loisy is still alive: but he has quite changed his ground. When he wrote *L'Evangile et L'Eglise* and *Autour d'un petit livre*, he seems to have been confident that the Roman Curia would allow him to make a broad distinction between dogma which was to be accepted on faith, and history which was matter of evidence. He argued the case with great skill: but unfortunately he forgot that the one virtue which Rome estimates above all others is obedience. The Roman Curia would not admit the rights of scientific history; and as there could be no appeal from its decision, Loisy was struck down with one judgment after another, until he was driven to the refuge of the Collège de France.

The fate of Duchesne was outwardly very different. He occupied honourable positions all his life, he was made a Monsignor by the Pope; and it was said that, if Leo XIII had lived longer, he might have received a cardinal's hat. Through his life ran the same clashing which wrecked his contemporaries, but as he never defied the verdict of Rome, and at least nominally submitted to it, he died within the pale.

I take the main facts in the career of Duchesne from a masterly obituary in the *Revue archéologique*, written by M. Salomon Reinach, one of the few archæologists who stand in the same scientific rank as Duchesne himself. Like Renan, Duchesne was of Breton origin, his father was a mariner who perished at sea off Newfoundland. After receiving a seminarist education he went to study at the French School of Rome, and

at once fell under the influence of the celebrated archæologist, De Rossi. Probably no study so much disposes one to a strictly scientific view of history as archæology; and this appeared even in Duchesne's thesis for the doctorate. He took as his subject the *Liber Pontificalis*, the history of the early popes, which was regarded at Rome as of unimpeachable authority. After collating 150 manuscripts and carrying through much research, he showed that the nucleus of the book was composed in the sixth century; at first it was unofficial, but it received many accretions, and was taken over by the Roman Curia. So bold a thesis by a young Abbé naturally caused a stir, and was denounced to the *Index*: Duchesne at once wrote declaring that he was ready to submit to the decision of so venerated an authority; and on this occasion he escaped with a mere warning. Shortly afterwards, being nominated to a Professorship at the Catholic Institute at Paris, presided over by Mgr. d'Hulst, he gave lectures on the early history of the Church, lectures for a time very successful. But when he issued lithographic copies of these lectures there was much scandal. Pupils of the seminary of Saint Sulpice were forbidden to frequent the Professor, and the Jesuit Cardinal Franzelin protested against the invasion of Catholic lecture-rooms by principles of interpretation borrowed from the Universities of Germany.

A few years later, from a chair in the *Ecole des Hautes* Etudes, Duchesne advanced on to a ground in some ways as dangerous, the legendary history of the foundation of the Gallic Churches. They were supposed to derive their origin at Chartres, Sens, Troyes, and Orléans, from some of the first disciples, Saints Savinianus, Altinus, and Potentianus. Not unnaturally, the Churches in question objected to doubt being thrown on their antiquity: local feeling was outraged, so that it was dangerous for the Professor to appear in some of the more backward communities of France. But, as M. Reinach observes, at that time there was a strong liberal current in the Church; and the treatise on the origin of episcopal dioceses in France was in most quarters accepted with respect; the Bollandists and the Benedictines approved the work of Duchesne: only the Capucins and other diehards maintained opposition.

At this time Duchesne's brilliant pupil, Loisy, began to attract attention. The two soon became somewhat estranged, for Duchesne would never accept the appellation *Modernist*. He always maintained that the dogmas of the Church are not to be discussed: he accepted *en bloc* its theology, and wanted to set forth the history of that theology, without going into the question of its validity or its philosophic grounds. 'I find no difficulty,' he wrote, 'as to the Trinity or the Incarnation: if I hesitated, it would rather be in view of the doctrine of a personal creative Deity.' In these days it is difficult to say on what ledge on the long slope down from conventional orthodoxy an able man may not be able to rest. Many of us will say, he ought to have gone further; yet it is quite possible that by drawing a rigid line between dogma and history, he may in the long run have helped the liberal cause. We know some conspicuous examples in England of men who have by resolutely turning a blind eye to possible developments of their beliefs, maintained a valuable influence. In spite of the obstinacies of individuals, the logic of a situation works steadily, and no one can stop it.

Meantime the reputation of Duchesne had grown steadily. Doctorates from Louvain, Cracow, Würzburg, Cambridge and Oxford flowed in upon him; he was elected member of a number of national academies of sciences, and of the French Institute; and in 1895 was appointed by M. Poincaré Director of the French School of Rome, where he found a great field of work in archæology, and a permanent refuge.

But meanwhile a great storm was brewing. In 1895 appeared the first volume of his *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*. He was induced to print it partly that he might supersede the lithographed edition of his earlier lectures on the subject which was in circulation. It is a work of the highest order, and of keen scientific method; but the instructed reader will note in it a number of intentional omissions. Duchesne had neither the will nor the courage to oppose the Roman curia; and he humorously complained that no insurance company would secure him against the *Index*. In some ways he reminds us of Erasmus, whose portrait, with that of Mommsen, adorned his study. But his reticences, though they moderated, could not avert the storm. He

indiscreetly allowed an Italian translation to appear; and that at once aroused to the attack the powerful *Unita Cattolica*. In 1911 the Consistory, with the full consent of the Pope, addressed to the Bishops of Italy a circular condemning the *History* as extremely dangerous and sometimes mortal (*exitiale*), so that its introduction to the Seminaries, even as a work of reference, must be absolutely prohibited, in consequence of its purposeful and repeated omissions, sometimes of matters of the greatest importance, especially when the supernatural was involved. The author, the circular proceeds, not only does not give a true notion of the history of the Church, but he falsifies and disfigures it greatly by representing the Church as almost deprived of those supernatural *charismata* on which it is based, and without which it cannot develop. He is also accused of diminishing the number of martyrs, and in some cases accusing them of fanaticism, and representing the persecutors as men of genius, urged to persecution by a great political ideal. The Fathers are, in the history, diminished or even reduced to nullity. Matters of capital importance, the cult of the Virgin, the Unity of the Church, the attitude of Rome, are treated amiss.

Some of the French bishops followed suit in excluding from their dioceses the French edition of the work, and in 1912 it appeared on the *Index*. But after all, the matter was not so serious as it looked. Duchesne addressed to the Cardinal Prefect of the *Index* a letter in which he says, 'a faithful son of the Church, I must submit to its decisions. I therefore declare to your Excellency that I bow respectfully to the decree in regard to my book.' This was regarded by the Congregation of the *Index* as a praiseworthy submission to the decree. There the matter ended. The condemnation has not been revoked; but the relations between the Vatican and the Director of the School of Rome did not cease. Shortly before his death Duchesne had an interview with the Pope, and received his benediction. And at his funeral many Roman ecclesiastics were present.

The whole business clearly illustrates the spirit of Rome. Duchesne and Loisy, his pupil, were at first in complete accord. They stood for the same principle, that Rome is infallible in matters of dogma and cult, but not in matters of history. The difference between them lay in this, that when Loisy was con-

demned he began to argue : when Duchesne was condemned he simply submitted, but without changing anything in his published works. Duchesne as *subjectus* was passed by, Loisy as *superbus*, though of course not in the ordinary sense of the word, was struck down. Fortunately both were able to find refuge in appointments in the gift of the French Government, so that their means of living were assured.

In some cases Duchesne was a valuable champion of the Roman point of view. He brought all his abilities and his prestige to the support of the claim of Rome to be *mater ecclesiarum*; and he engaged in a vigorous controversy with the Greek patriarch Anthimius on the subject. In 1896 he was concerned in the project, at first not condemned by Leo XIII, for recognition of Anglican orders. But on closer study he convinced himself that from the Catholic point of view the English ordinations were invalid. The project was at the time supposed to have failed mainly through the opposition of the English Cardinals : but one does not see how it can ever have had a chance of success. Probably no Frenchman, with his logical mind, will ever quite understand the English Church : but it is clear that Rome would demand a submission which few Anglicans would dream of according.

To many of us the most interesting result of the collision between Rome and such devoted adherents of hers as Loisy and Duchesne is this : that it shows it to be possible for a historian to acquire such a devotion to historic truth, to develop so imperious a conscience in the matter, that it can hold out against deep feelings of love and devotion to an inherited and cherished religion, and utterly refuse to be stifled by them.

I would not say that this is a full account of the matter. The vehement assertions of Loisy may have been, in Roman eyes, very different from the studied reticences of Duchesne. It is not easy for one who writes from a very different point of view to be quite just to the Roman Church. But I may venture, without Pharisaism, to say that Anglican Modernists who find it possible to combine fidelity to historic truth with devotion to the Church of their fathers are in a far happier position than the great French historians of whom I have written.

THE SPIRITUAL POETS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY*

By J. H. Fowler,

Editor of *Palgrave's Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics*; *Life and Letters of Edward Lee Hicks*, &c.

I.

In the history of English lyrical poetry the seventeenth century holds an unique place. It is the period in which, in the best of Herrick's verse, it reached that absolute grace and perfection of form which the reader of the ancient classics associates with Sappho and Catullus; and the period in which Milton's minor poems exhibited a combination of melody and majesty with lucidity which English poets have never attained before or since. It is also the period in which devotional verse put forth flowers that for exquisite beauty and fragrance cannot be matched in all the range of our literature. With the literary importance of these poems I am not now directly concerned. The question I propose to attempt to answer is this: How far do the religious poems of the seventeenth century make any appeal to us in the twentieth *as religious poems*? How far do they possess for us an interest which is deeper than any merely historical or literary interest? How far, in other words, can they help us to understand and share and express high and worthy emotions about the deepest thing in human life and destiny—the relation of the soul of man to his Maker?

The question is not so entirely separate from the question of literary value as might be supposed. For a main element in the literary value of poetry is what, in the widest sense of the word, may be called its spiritual value and its power to express noble and beautiful feeling. And the reason why poetry can in some ways express this better than prose is that in poetry words, as Frederick Myers finely said, are 'raised to a higher power,' are able to convey to the mind, with the help of rhythm and association, far more than they directly state.

*A paper read to the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union, Dec. 4, 1923.

Of the greatest poem of the seventeenth century, or perhaps of any century, in English literature, I suppose it would be true to say that its religious value for us is almost non-existent. We may make exceptions in favour of isolated passages—perhaps most of all in favour of the magnificent exordium to Book III, with the wonderful lines that express the majesty and mystery of Creation :

> 'The rising World of waters dark and deep
> Won from the void and formless infinite,'

or the beauty of the Holy Land :

> 'Sion, and the flowery brooks beneath
> That wash thy hallowed feet;'

or the pathos of the blind poet's prayer :

> 'So much the rather thou, celestial Light,
> Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers
> Irradiate; there plant eyes, all mist from thence
> Purge and disperse, that I may see and tell
> Of things invisible to mortal sight.'

The influence of *Paradise Lost* upon English religion has been very great, and unfortunately much of it, the support lent to a rigid Calvinistic theology, has been harmful. But that influence has spent itself, and there is some danger that, in reacting from it, we may forget what there still is of value for us in Milton's religion. One thing indeed we do not cease to remember. I doubt whether any other fourteen lines in all English poetry have helped to teach so powerfully the higher kind of patience, the readiness to accept God's will not in any spirit of fatalistic acquiescence, but in a temper of active loyalty, as that Sonnet on his Blindness which ends with the quiet but unforgettable line :

> 'They also serve who only stand and wait.'

Nor are we likely to forget, perhaps, the supreme loveliness of that vision of his dead wife, 'my late espoused Saint, brought to me like Alcestis from the grave.' But the material imagery of Milton's Heaven, as well as of Milton's Hell, has grown so strange to us that we may be inclined to forget how literally the blind poet's prayer was answered :

> 'So much the rather thou, celestial Light,
> Shine inward.'

'No part of the universe,' says Mr. John Bailey, 'was more real to him than heaven, the abode of God and angels and spirits, the original and ultimate home of his beloved music and light. It is noticeable that there is hardly a single poem of his—*L'Allegro* and *Samson* are the only important ones—in which he does not at one point or other make his escape to heaven. In most of them, as all through the *Nativity Ode* and the *Solemn Music*, in the conclusions of *Lycidas* and *Il Penseroso*, in the opening of *Comus*, this heavenly flight provides passages of exceptional and peculiarly Miltonic beauty.' In his Ode on *The Progress of Poesy*, Gray has seized this unique splendour of Milton's poetry:

> 'He passed the flaming bounds of Place and Time:
> The living Throne, the sapphire-blaze,
> Where Angels tremble, while they gaze,
> He saw; but blasted with excess of light,
> Closed his eyes in endless night.'

Gray's conception is magnificent: yet, I think, in sober fact the exceeding brightness of this heavenly vision was not the cause of the poet's blindness so much as the glorious compensation for the darkening of the earthly landscape. The wonderful cheerfulness with which the blind almost habitually bear their calamity has often been remarked, and doubtless has made not a few of us at times ashamed of our disposition to repine at trivial misfortunes. In spite of tradition, which has tended to represent Milton as a dour Puritan, and therefore a killjoy to his daughters and others, I believe that he was no exception to this rule of the cheerfulness of the blind. He was naturally sociable—fond of his friends, as his sonnets bear witness, and of the 'mirth that after no repenting draws.' But from early manhood he seems always to have lifted up his thoughts

> 'Above the smoke and stir of this dim spot'

to a radiant vision of pure and perfect bliss in the presence of 'the Father of Lights with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning.' For him the old riddle of the Greek poet, 'Who knows if what we call Life be not Death, and Death Life?' admitted of but one answer. The expression in one of the sonnets:

> 'This earthly load
> Of death, called life, which us from life doth sever,'

was to him, we may be sure, no mere rhetorical formula. And when blindness came on, and each returning day only 'brought back his night,' and still more when the Stuart Restoration set up wickedness in high places and reduced him to the condition of his Samson,

> 'Eyeless in Gaza at the mill with slaves,'

or, as he tells us of himself

> 'Fallen on evil days,
> On evil days though fallen and evil tongues;
> In darkness, and with dangers compassed round,
> And solitude,'

he must have withdrawn himself more and more into that inner vision whose glory is always shining through his verse.

A strange contrast to Milton in many ways is afforded by John Donne, the most enigmatic and bizarre figure in English literature, with the possible exception of Swift. The Puritan Milton was strongly self-disciplined from boyhood, called at Cambridge 'the Lady' from the purity of his life and conversation, and he regarded poetry as a high vocation to which his talents and industry should be unremittingly dedicated. Donne was a Catholic by upbringing, a high Anglican afterwards, a sensualist in his youth, a man of strong passions and bitter repentances, in his serious hours more occupied with thoughts of the grave and the worms at their banquet upon the corpse than with imaginations of heaven and 'the Bridegroom with his feastful friends.' He never regarded poetry as the real business of his life, and though he won fame in select circles by his early love-poems, he was afterwards remorseful that he had ever written them or allowed others to see them, and even the devotional pieces of his later years he left to be collected by others and published posthumously. But though Donne's verse falls into two such distinct and even opposed groups, the religious poetry is marked by the same characteristic as the secular—the union of intellect and passion. It reaches perfection in his *Hymn to God the Father.* The fact that Donne is a highly skilled artist here, setting himself to accomplish, and succeeding in accomplishing, wonders with a severely restricted vocabu-

lary gives no reason for suspecting the sincerity and depth of his emotion.

'Wilt Thou forgive that sin where I begun
Which was my sin though it were done before?
Wilt Thou forgive that sin, through which I run
And do run still: though still I do deplore?
When Thou hast done, Thou has not done;
For I have more.

'Wilt Thou forgive that sin which I have won
Others to sin? And made my sins their door?
Wilt Thou forgive that sin which I did shun
A year or two, but wallowed in a score?
When Thou hast done, Thou has not done;
For I have more.

'I have a sin of fear, that when I have spun
My last thread, I shall perish on the shore,
But swear by Thyself, that at my death Thy sun
Shall shine as he shines now, and heretofore;
And having done that Thou hast done;
I fear no more.'

'He caused it,' says Walton, 'to be set to a most grave and solemn tune, and to be often sung to the organ by the choristers of St. Paul's Church in his own hearing, especially at the evening service, and at his return from his customary devotions in that place did occasionally say to a friend, "The words of this hymn have restored to me the same thoughts of joy that possessed my soul in my sickness when I composed it."' Equally beautiful is the first stanza of another *Hymn to God*, said by Walton to have been composed upon his death-bed but really written about the same time as the hymn already quoted.

'Since I am coming to that holy room,
Where with the choir of saints for evermore
I shall be made Thy music, as I come
I tune the instrument here at the door,
And what I must do then, think here before.'

This stanza seems to me peculiarly modern in its carefully sought Pre-Raphaelite simplicity. If we did not know who had written it, we might conjecture that it was by T. E. Brown, who has passages that come very close to it. Of Donne's penitential verse, let me quote one beautiful stanza:

'O Holy Ghost, whose temple I
Am, but of mud walls and condensed dust,
And being sacrilegiously
Half wasted with youth's fires of pride and lust,

Must with new storms be weather-beat;
Double in my heart Thy flame,
Which let devout sad tears intend; and let
(Though this glass lanthorn flesh do suffer maim)
Fire, sacrifice, priest, altar, be the same.'

I have spoken of Donne's pre-occupation with thoughts of the grave—'this posthume death,' as he calls it, 'this death after burial, this dissolution after dissolution, this death of corruption and putrefaction, of vermiculation and incineration'—to quote only a few of his phrases. Let me illustrate it by one brief quotation from his last sermon, where the likeness of his speculations to those which Shakespeare attributes to Hamlet is curiously exemplified:

'That all that Monarch, who spred over many nations alive, must in his dust lie in a corner of that sheete of lead, and there, but so long as that lead will laste, and that private and retired man, that thought himselfe his owne for ever, and never came forth, must in his dust of the grave be published, and (such are the revolutions of the graves) bee mingled with the dust of every high way, and of every dunghill, and swallowed in every puddle and pond; This is the most inglorious and contemptible vilification, the most deadly and peremptory nullification of man, that ye can consider.'

Remembering this morbid tendency, we may value all the more the splendid sonnet in which his faith triumphs over mortality and 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'

'Death, be not proud, though some have called thee
Mighty and dreadful, for thou art not so;
For those whom thou think'st thou dost overthrow
Die not, poor Death! nor yet canst thou kill me.
From rest and sleep, which but thy picture be,
Much pleasure, then from thee much more must flow;
And soonest our best men with thee do go,
Rest of their bones, and soul's delivery.
Thou'rt slave to fate, chance, kings, and desperate men,
And dost with poison, war. and sickness dwell;
And poppy or charm can make us sleep as well
And better than thy stroke. Why swell'st thou then?
One short sleep past, we wake eternally;
And Death shall be no more; Death, thou shalt die!'

In passing from Donne to Herbert, we come to a figure very like him in some ways, very unlike in others: like him as a poet in the love of fantastic conceits and quibbles and experiments; like him as a man in the social circle to which they belonged—Donne came of a good family, and on his mother's side was descended from Sir Thomas More; Herbert

was the younger brother of Lord Herbert of Cherbury—and in the worldly ambitions, though not in the vices, of youth; like him in the hesitation about a profession and in the final choice; very unlike in the peaceful serenity of the pastorate at Bemerton as portrayed in Walton's pages. A direct personal link between the two poets is the friendship between Herbert's mother and Donne. She had much to do with the religious bent of Donne's later life, and he repaid his debt to her by an affectionate interest in her son and also by the lovely couplet:

> 'Nor spring nor summer beauty has such grace
> As I have seen in an autumnal face.'

The personality and poetry of George Herbert are rightly counted among the most precious historical possessions of the English Church. He seems to typify all that is best and most characteristic in it—the influence of saintliness and culture, the true Christian and the true gentleman, quietly permeating a whole countryside by sheer virtue of its attractive beauty. His writings set forth his ideal for the country church and its pastor: the building, the services, the life of the minister, were all to teach the same lessons.

The two most familiar poems in *The Temple* are the parable called 'The Pulley' ('When God at first made man'), given in *The Golden Treasury*, and the poem quoted in *The Compleat Angler*, which begins:

> 'Sweet Day, so cool, so calm, so bright,
> The bridal of the earth and sky.'

I need not linger upon them, except to say that in the second of them Herbert is for once the equal of Herrick in lyrical grace. But I cannot forbear to recall the words in which the Angler introduces his quotation:

> 'Piscator.—And now, scholar! my direction for thy fishing is ended with this shower, for it has done raining. And now look about you, and see how pleasantly that meadow looks; nay, and the earth smells as sweetly too. Come, let me tell you what holy Herbert says of such days and showers as these; and then we will thank God that we enjoy them.'

My own quotations shall be, first, three stanzas from the autobiographic poem called 'Affliction':

> 'At first Thou gavest me milk and sweetnesses;
> I had my wish and way:

My days were strewed with flowers and happiness:
There was no month but May.
But with my years sorrow did twist and grow,
And made a party unawares for woe . . .

'Whereas my birth and spirit rather took
The way that takes the town,
Thou didst betray me to a lingering book,
And wrap me in a gown.
I was entangled in the world of strife,
Before I had the power to change my life . . .

'Now I am here, what Thou wilt do with me
None of my books will show:
I read, and sigh, and wish I were a tree—
For sure, then, I should grow
To fruit or shade; at least, some bird would trust
Her household to me, and I should be just.'

Next, a parable less well known than it deserves to be:

THE QUIP.

'The merry world did on a day
With his train-bands and mates agree
To meet together, where I lay,
And all in sport to jeer at me.

'First, Beauty crept into a rose;
Which when I plucked not, 'Sir,' said she,
'Tell me, I pray, whose hands are those?'
But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.

'Then Money came, and chinking still,
'What tune is this, poor man?' said he:
'I heard in music you had skill';
But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.

'Then came brave Glory puffing by
In silks that whistled, who but he!
He scarce allowed me half an eye:
But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.

'Then came quick Wit and Conversation,
And he would needs a comfort be,
And, to be short, make an oration;
But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.

'Yet when the hour of Thy design
To answer these fine things shall come,
Speak not at large—say, 'I am thine,'
And then they have their answer home.'

Another beautiful and characteristic poem is 'Love bade me welcome,' given in the *Oxford Book of Verse.*

LILY DOUGALL

MISS Lily Dougall was born in Montreal. Her parents were of Scottish descent and belonged to the Presbyterian Church. Her early life in Montreal was exceedingly happy, and her affectionate relationship with her parents and the happiness of her home probably gave to her the strong feeling, which was so characteristic of her religious outlook, that we cannot conceive of God as being anything greater or higher than our Father. She never had full sympathy with people such as the Christian Scientists and members of Higher Thought Movements, who felt that they needed some idea of God other than that of Fatherhood; and like so many people whose childhood has been full of happy recollections, she was entirely satisfied in regarding our relationship towards God very simply, as that of happy children with an altogether good Father.

I remember her telling me that when she was a little girl she once found her mother in great trouble. When she enquired what it was that was making her sad, her mother replied that some neighbour had called in the most terrible trouble: his son had gone out of his mind, and showed his madness by persisting in kneeling down before his father all day, and beseeching his father to have mercy upon him. Miss Dougall, being herself but a child, was very much puzzled over this case; she quite saw how terrible it was that the child had so absolutely lost confidence in his father's love, and yet she could not help feeling that he was only behaving towards his father as Christians generally are taught to behave towards God. Here, again, I think that her early experiences gave some colour to her religious thought. There was nothing more characteristic of her mind than the certainty she possessed that God always wills that we should be happy, and that it is our duty rather to be continually believing that our Heavenly Father loves and understands us than to spend our time in asking Him to have

mercy upon us, when we know it to be impossible that He should do otherwise. I remember a talk with her two or three years ago, after she had met M. Emil Coué at my house. M. Coué had been saying how valuable psychologically a Litany could be, and I was saying to Miss Dougall that it was unexpected to find M. Coué uphold a Litany as a psychological exercise. Miss Dougall at once turned to me and said, 'That is very true; but there is all the difference between a Litany in which you keep repeating, "I am getting better and better," and a Litany in which we say, "Spare us, good Lord, and be not angry with us for ever."'

Miss Dougall came in early life to Edinburgh, and there devoted herself for some years to the care of an aunt. She spent her spare time in acquiring a very considerable degree of University education, so that she was able to read the Greek Testament for herself, and she also had a wide knowledge of ancient and modern literature. She began in Edinburgh her career as a novelist. Her first and best-known novel, *Beggars All*, appeared in 1891. In the following years she published *The Zeit Geist*, *The Madonna of a Day*, *A Dozen Ways of Love*, *The Mormon Prophet*, *Paths of the Righteous*, and others.

The strong religious interest of her mind is seen in her novels, but it was not till 1900 that she issued her first theological book, *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, and that anonymously, for she judged that her name as a woman novelist would not commend her theological work to serious consideration. *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* was followed by a series of theological books all written anonymously. The identity of the author was only divulged after seven years, when she began to be known as a theological writer of great originality. After *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* the most popular were *Christus Futurus* and *The Practice of Christianity*. I believe she herself regarded *Voluntas Dei* as the most serious exposition of her theological standpoint. These books, although they were not so well known in definitely ecclesiastical circles, had a very considerable power in fashioning the thought of those who were then growing up. Miss Dougall, so characteristically, felt that it was worth any amount of time and trouble to influence those who were young

and beginning to think. I remember her highly commending a young American clergyman for not spending his time in listening to aged pundits of theology, but going to conferences where he met those who were already influencing the young men and women just out of the Universities.

She felt that theological writers were spending too much time upon the comparatively small remnant of people who still continue to attend the services of the Church, and were thinking far too little of that much larger body of people who, while still profoundly interested in religious questions, have become, from one cause or another, alienated from any external fellowship of Christians.

In 1912 she moved from Exmouth, where she had been living for some years, and bought a cottage at Cumnor, which she transformed into a most charming house. It has a wonderful view right over the upper valley of the Thames to the distant Cotswold hills. It was at this house that she and her friend, Miss Earp (to whom all Miss Dougall's friends feel they owe a very deep debt for what she has done, both to make Miss Dougall's work possible and to make all her friends happy), entertained a succession of conferences which have had a very marked influence on theological thought, both among those who accepted, and those who rejected, the point of view which came to be associated with the 'Cumnor Group.' I remember that it was at one of the earliest of these conferences (called to discuss the programme of the Guild of Health, in which she took a deep interest) that we heard of the outbreak of the Great War. I recollect her praying that 'whoever may be slain in this war, the spirit of war itself may be slain.' She set herself at once to throw open her house to Belgian refugees, and was amused to find the politeness of her Belgian guests (who sat loosely to their Roman Catholic faith) led them to be ready to attend the village church, perhaps encouraged thereto by the sane and affectionate and simple piety of Cutts' End.

Soon after this Miss Dougall began the series of conferences which led to her first group book, *Concerning Prayer*. This book contained the very remarkable essay by A. C. Turner, which I feel always has not been really appreciated as it deserved. It was drawn out of him by Miss Dougall with infinite

difficulty and persuasion, and very soon afterwards 'Archie' Turner went to the war and was killed. There followed *Immortality* and *The Spirit*, produced by a much smaller number of contributors, and enlivened by the sparkling wit and learning of Mr. Clutton Brock. In all these books Canon Streeter took a leading part, and to him, as much as to Miss Dougall, they owe their origin.

All through these years, Miss Dougall was a prominent figure at conferences, such as those of the Student Christian Movement, the Churchmen's Union, the Anglican Fellowship, the Guild of Health and others. She had a very real affection for the Churchmen's Union, and was disposed to be indignant when it was suggested that its members were lacking in devotion or spiritual zeal. She was impressed by the strength of the devotional spirit at the daily Eucharists at these conferences. I think, at the same time, she was anxious that the Modernist movement should be definitely connected with positive and constructive religious effort, and not exclusively concerned in contending with theological obscurantism and ecclesiastical intolerance. This desire for a human and evangelical outlook gave her a very great zeal to forward the work of the Guild of Health. She was on the Committee of that Guild from about 1913 onwards, and took a very keen part in all that concerned it up to the very time of her passing from us. She wrote for it a pamphlet and also a text-book, *The Christian Doctrine of Health*. She did not approve of the revival of unction as a healing suggestion technique, and spoke and wrote earnestly against it; but she was careful to say that this was not because she was not a believer in sacraments, but that she thought this particular sacrament had been wisely laid aside by the Church of England. Last July she joined with me in taking a retreat-conference for the Guild in Lancashire, and I was struck once again by her wonderful power of combining great simplicity in religion with very great critical acumen, a profound sympathy and a very merry sense of humour.

In party politics she had not much interest, but in all social questions she took the progressive side. She had a passionate hatred of war, and a profound distrust of coercion as a means of education.

Religious labels had little significance for her. She had a keen sense of fellowship with Free Churchmen, and a great desire for the closer union of all who shared the Christian faith. After her death the chapel service at Cumnor was given up one Sunday evening in order that the congregation might join in the memorial service at the village church and hear Canon Streeter's sermon on the lessons of her life.

She had thought about, and made some investigation into, 'Spiritism,' and had a considered and decided distrust of the experiences on which that movement is founded.

One of the last things Miss Dougall did at this year's Girton Conference was to write out a suggestion for next year's Conference. She felt very keenly the need for reconciling the religion which has its basis in belief in the validity of our ultimate values with the scientific sense of the sacredness of the facts of science. She felt that the contrast continually emphasized in religious literature between the natural and the supernatural, discovery and revelation, nature and miracle, is profoundly untrue and unchristian. She was saying, in almost her last days among us, that she felt that this distinction (false, as she thought it) was the root of her distrust of Anglo-Catholic theology. She felt that a great need of our time was to show that the course of nature is not really at variance with the ultimate triumph of Christian values, and that the 'miraculous' or 'supernatural' is only a further revelation of what is now called 'natural' in our present state of knowledge.

The loss to the Church of Miss Dougall, and, in the same year, of her friend and co-worker, Cyril Emmet, is one which, though it has seemed to pass almost unnoticed in the strictly ecclesiastical world, will be felt most profoundly among those, both here and in Canada and the United States, who have had their whole religious outlook stirred and enlightened by a really critical and always affectionate and devout mind; and those who knew her well, and have from time to time shared her home, feel that they know something of what the Kingdom might be when the teaching of the Lord is lived out in an atmosphere of beauty and kindliness and wisdom and hard work.

HAROLD ANSON.

THE CALL TO SERVICE

OUR BOYHOOD'S DEBT TO THOSE WHO SAVED ENGLAND FOR THEM*

FIVE years ago to-day, a little before noon, we here at Sherborne heard the news of the Armistice which had been struck at eleven that morning. The news was by no means unexpected. Our allies and our own armies had been advancing victoriously for some time, latterly meeting practically no opposition. The resistance of Germany had utterly collapsed. The question was simply how soon the victors would grant an armistice; surrender was bound to be practically unconditional. So, as I say, the news of the surrender was not unexpected. We all knew some time beforehand that we had won the war. And yet the actual moment of receiving the news of the Armistice was a moment of supreme emotion, of the feeling of relief. Not to you who are still boys now and were quite young boys then: for there are only half-a-dozen of you who were here then, and all but one of those in their first term. But to all who were old enough to have felt the weariness and heartache of those four years, which seemed as the months dragged on to be settling down into a timeless monotony of sorrow, the actual cessation of slaughter came like an incredible release from some hopeless nightmare—'then were we like unto them that dream; then was our mouth filled with laughter'—or were they choking sobs? At any rate it was an inexpressible relief.

That was the overmastering feeling of myriads of men and women of all ages, of all classes, on that 11th of November, 1918—relief at the cessation of slaughter. No more of that anxious waiting for news of husband or father or brother, or of that sense of unavailing sympathy when news of loss came to the houses of friends and neighbours. And with this feeling of relief was mingled the recollection of the dead, a heartache indeed, yet in that hour alleviated by a tender and reverent sense of their triumph, of the consummation of their sacrifice. *Consummatum erat*: it was finished. The sacrifice of dear lives, which sometimes seemed so fruitless while the end was not in

* A Sermon preached in Sherborne School Chapel on Sunday, November 11th, 1923 (Armistice Day) by Nowell Smith, M.A., Headmaster. Copies of it, price 7d., can be obtained from F. Bennett, Sherborne, Dorset. The proceeds will be given to Lord Haig's Fund.

sight, seemed now no longer vain. Many a bereaved one felt a joy through all the pangs of emptiness in the thought that beyond the veil brave spirits were rejoicing that the end for which they had willingly offered themselves was won.

I cannot speak from experience of what other emotions of relief and triumph may have swept through those who were privileged to face death and wounds and hardships in the Great War. But they too shared the feelings of which I have spoken. And so it came about that by an instinctive consensus of us all, Armistice Day was from the first, and remains, essentially the Festival of our heroic Dead. For thousands of us some spot of soil in France or Belgium, in Gallipoli or Mesopotamia, some depth of sea, is sacred to our own peculiar grief: but to all of us the common centre and symbol of our thoughts to-day has been that monument, scarcely divided by a few yards of space, and only one in sentiment and meaning, the Cenotaph in Whitehall and the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in the Abbey.

Our thoughts, our prayers, our praises, have centred all day about our glorious Dead. There is no need or fitness for me to labour to add words to these thoughts, these prayers, these praises in so far as they have been a tribute to our departed comrades. Their bodies have returned to the elements of our mortality; their name liveth for evermore; their lives are in the keeping of their Father and ours. It only remains now in the quiet evening of our Festival to turn our faces to the future and to take with us from the memories of to-day what hope, what fortitude, what faith and strength of purpose we may win for our future course in a world which is crying with an exceeding bitter cry for the very best that each one of us can give.

I noticed at the beginning how very few of you had ever reached the age of Public School boyhood on that first Armistice Day five years ago. And what I have hitherto said can have appealed, if it has appealed at all, only in a slight degree to any but the adult members of this audience. And yet I hear in the blended notes of this Day of Remembrance and Thanksgiving, an appeal most clear and solemn to all of you who are spending a happy, healthy boyhood in this school. *They* died that *you* might live. Those names which you pass every day as you go to and from this chapel are silent witnesses of the debt you owe not only to the bearers of those names, not only to the

blessed Dead, but to all who served and suffered in the Great War, many thousands of whom are called to bear pains and privations which make death seem far the happier lot. Everything that you enjoy, everything that you hold dear, you owe by God's grace to those who gave up all to fight for right and freedom, for home and country.

For just think for one moment what else Armistice Day marks for us besides the memory of our Dead. It marks for us in this country the deliverance from a frightful menace, the menace of a doom of which we can barely imagine the darkness as we look out on the present miseries of our late foes, and indeed of some of our allies. Armistice Day records the victory of our arms. I suppose most of you take it for granted that our victory was a foregone conclusion. Even in the darkest days of the war I fancy there were very few of us who believed in the possibility of our ultimate defeat. Whether we were right or wrong, that very confidence was part of what we owed to the incomparable courage and tenacity of our fighters. But just imagine what it would have meant to you if Germany had won the war. Imagine it on the material side. Instead of comfortable homes, good food, all the necessities and many of the luxuries of life, instead of health and games and all the opportunities of developing your powers to the utmost, imagine want, perpetual hunger, cold, disease, a dreary monotony of suffering. Think of our life here as it is: and then listen to a few words from a letter written to Oxford by a famous German Professor[1] which I read in this week's number of the *Oxford Magazine*. It refers to University students, but the same would hold good of schoolboys. 'The plight of the students,' he writes, 'is very distressing; they live in rooms which they cannot heat; the great majority are underfed: some of them are near to death by starvation.' And then add to this the loss of freedom. For if in a part of Germany to-day the population is held down 'beneath the proud foot of a conqueror,' it is very certain that, if the spirit that urged Germany on to that mad dream of conquest had proved triumphant, no indignities of vassalage would have been spared to her most dangerous, most envied rival in the dust. You, who were but children then, would have been the first generation of boys in England to

[1] Professor Adolph von Harnack.

forego the birthright of the freeborn, since the Saxons among your ancestors were forced to bear the yoke of William the Norman. Does it sound fanciful and far-fetched? Ah! if it does, remember then that *you* did not win this heritage of freedom, you did not save it. You owe it to your fathers of old, to all those who have made England great and free, who have built up this school and many others in the land to be the happy training ground of free and generous and dutiful servants of God in Church and State: and by God's grace you owe its preservation for your own inheritance to those, living and dead, whose service and whose sacrifice we commemorate to-day.

Such is your debt. I need surely say but little on the point of honour—how to discharge it. 'Here and here did England help me—how can I help England?' We owe our very lives to God, in whom we live and move and have our being. We owe to Jesus Christ the revelation of that life of faith in God as our loving Father, which he created us to live. We owe to the Holy Spirit of God ever present with us the power, if not to live that life in its perfection here on earth, yet evermore to rise from our failures with new hope, evermore to climb higher out of the fogs and mists of our selfish passions towards the clear light of eternal Truth. But while we owe all to God, it is not irreverent to recognize the agencies which God employs to pour out His benefits upon us, and the particular parts of our indebtedness proper to each. I repeat, then, 'Here and here did England help me—how can I help England? How show my gratitude to our glorious Dead and to the famous men and our Fathers that begat us?'

Surely there is only one way—by service of our country. I have here the proof of an article by a well-known general which was sent to me a few days ago by an enterprising editor for comment—I presume the article has by now appeared. In the article, among other disputable propositions, he asserts that the tone of Public Schools has now become intellectual, and that this is a portent to which the invention of aeroplanes is a joke. But he goes on to what he calls the reverse of the medal, and says, 'The idea of public service has gone and the idea of the personal career has quietly stepped into its shoes': and he adds that this 'is a subtle disease spreading through the schools of England.'

Now, in so far as the General implies that the schools are responsible for the spread of this disease, it would be easy to prove on the contrary that the schools consciously and even passionately strive to stem the flood of materialism and selfishness which is always threatening to drown our modern civilization. That we do not succeed to our heart's desire, is too true. The General thinks that all that is needed is a return to the good old days of incessant corporal punishment: but as he also thinks that the modern boy does nothing to deserve it, he is in something of a dilemma. Severity may have its merits; but injustice is surely a bad foundation for character-building. However that may be, it is indisputably true that for you who are now boys at school the choice between God and Mammon, Service and Selfishness, is set in a more acute form than it was when the General and I were young. The causes of this are too many and too complicated to set out now. Some of them, both economic and social, are not mere subjects for denunciation, but for patient and careful study. But without doubt the pace at which material and mechanical invention has outstripped the moral development of the race, combined with the economic effects of so vast and destructive a war, has enormously enhanced the power of selfishness in the never-ending struggle for the soul of every man. '*Sauve qui peut*! Every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost! Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die'—these time-honoured maxims of worldliness are never so popular and plausible as in days of catastrophe and distress of nations—and these are the days (little you feel it here) in which your youth is cast. 'These times strike worldlings'—monied or unmonied—'with dismay'; and you will have no lack of kindly-meant but disastrous advice to sell your souls—those expensive luxuries—for Mammon's allowance of daily bread.

But, on the other hand, never has the Angel of Light shone over against his dark antagonist with brighter radiance than in this day of decision. Never has the call to every generous heart sounded so clear a summons to service: 'to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.' Never has the youth of a nation had set so splendidly before its face by its immediate predecessors the

example of courage, of chivalry, of dutiful endurance, of unworldly self-sacrifice.

'Blow out, you bugles, over the rich Dead!
There's none of these so lonely and poor of old,
But, dying, has made us rarer gifts than gold.
These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of work and joy, and that unhoped serene,
That men call age; and those who would have been,
Their sons, they gave, their immortality.

Blow, bugles, blow! They brought us, for our dearth,
Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain,
Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.'[2]

And you have come into your heritage—will you take it, or be the slaves and wear the livery of Mammon?

There came into my head again, just as I was writing, some sentences spoken at Oxford by John Ruskin more than fifty years ago—just when Germany was crossing the Rubicon between her legitimate greatness and that career of insane ambition, which has brought her so low—which, in spite of inevitable differences in detail, have a startlingly vivid relevance to our present situation, both as regards our social life and our international responsibility. I will close with them.

'There is a destiny now possible to us—the highest ever set before a nation to be accepted or refused. We are still undegenerate in race; a race mingled of the best northern blood. We are not dissolute in temper, but still have the firmness to govern, and the grace to obey. We have been taught a religion of pure mercy, which we must either now betray, or learn to defend by fulfilling. And we are rich in an inheritance of honour, bequeathed to us through a thousand years of noble history, which it should be our daily thirst to increase with splendid avarice, so that Englishmen, if it be a sin to covet honour, should be the most offending souls alive. Within the last few years we have had the laws of natural science opened to us with a rapidity which has been blinding by its brightness; and means of transit and communication given to us, which have made but one kingdom of the habitable globe. One kingdom;—but who is to be its king! Is there to be no king in it, think you, and every man to do that which is right in his own eyes? Or only kings of terror, and the obscene empires of Mammon and Belial? Or will you, youths of England, make your country again a royal throne of kings; a sceptred isle, for all the world a source of light, a centre of peace; mistress of Learning and the Arts;—faithful guardian of great memories in the midst of irreverent and ephemeral visions;—faithful servant of time-tried principles, under temptation from fond experiments and licentious desires; and amids-

[2] From *1914 and Other Poems*, by Rupert Brooke.

the cruel and clamorous jealousies of the nations, worshipped in her strange valour of goodwill towards men?'[3]

'*Worshipped in her strange valour of goodwill towards men.*' Mr. Whelen, whom many of us heard the other night, told me much of this pathetic worship of the name of England and the person of English men and women which he had experienced in his travels over the devastated countries of Europe: and Miss Payne, who is coming shortly to speak to us of her work among the starving Russians, gives a vivid impression of the same experience in her letters home. God grant that this 'valour of goodwill towards men' may always shine in the acts of England and of Englishmen till it be no more strange, but the earth may be full of goodwill, which is the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea! And God grant that from this school there may never be wanting a supply of such Englishmen, who, whatever their profession or business, shall be duly qualified—aye, and joyfully resolved, to serve God in Church and State with this same valour of goodwill towards men!

[3] From Ruskin, *Lectures on Art.*

BOOK REVIEWS

IDEALS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

This is a new volume of the Modern Churchmen's Library. It is an admirable little book, which fully sustains the high standard of the four volumes already published. Nothing can be more timely than a historical study of the three parties into which our Church is divided, and the work, within a narrow compass, could hardly have been better done.

Mr. Richardson starts with two principles of investigation. Knowledge of the past is the surest guide to the understanding of the present. And, the question as to the seat of authority in religion is of the greatest importance.

The authorities in Christianity are the Church, the Bible, and the human Spirit in its rational, moral, and religious activities. It makes a great difference which of these three is considered primary. If either of the first two is given precedence over the third, we have a theory of external revelation, the contents of which cannot be judged by human reason, or even by the enlightened conscience.

The Reformation was essentially a revolt to gain spiritual freedom; but the work was only half done in the sixteenth century. In its struggle against the great religion of authority, Protestantism was compelled to set up an external authority of its own; Bibliolatry took the place of submission to the Church. This check to the emancipation of the human spirit checked the progress of Protestantism; the real significance of the Reformation was partially lost sight of in the Reformed Churches.

* *The Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England,* by R. D. Richardson. (Murray; 6/-; pp. 251; 1923.)

But there was another movement, more directly indebted to the Renaissance—the northern Humanism, represented first by Erasmus, Colet, More and Warham. Its ancestry might be traced much further back—to the Alexandrians and the Fourth Gospel; but its new life began in the century of the Reformation. It helped to make the Church of England the most enlightened and comprehensive Church in Christendom.

Hooker places human reason next to Scripture as our authority. 'What Scripture hath plainly delivered, to that the first place both of credit and obedience is due; the next whereunto is whatsoever any man can necessarily conclude by force of reason: after these the voice of the Church succeedeth.' This would not have satisfied the Cambridge School in the seventeenth century; but when reason has been allowed an independent authority, it cannot long be kept in the second place.

Laud defends the truth of Christianity by four testimonies, none of which, he says, is sufficient by itself—the witness of the Church, of Scripture, of the Holy Ghost within us, and the natural reason. It is an entire mistake to suppose that Laud's position was near that of modern Anglo-Catholics. He avowed himself a Protestant, and the so-called Latitudinarians sprang from his party.

Mr. Richardson's *catena* of Liberal theology in England is profoundly interesting. He notices its close connexion with the Renaissance tradition, predominantly Platonic, and seems to agree with a modern Bishop, who cut short the confessions of a candidate for Holy Orders, a Fellow of his College, by asking him whether he was a Platonist or an Aristotelian. On hearing that he was a Platonist, he consented at once to ordain him! This young philosopher is now a diocesan Bishop himself.

In one of his essays, Aubrey Moore says that our theology is becoming more *Greek*, and welcomes the change as a support to the Catholic revival. Greek thought may indeed be a reconciler, but unfortunately the epigoni of the *Lux Mundi* School are steadily becoming more *Latin*.

Mr. Richardson might perhaps have called more attention to the abandonment of Calvinism by the Evangelical party. Calvinism was the main strength of the revolt against Rome, and the adoption of a gentler, more humanistic creed by Protestants is a really important change, the effects of which are not yet fully apparent. I think also that in his discussion of Modernism he might have shown more clearly the difference between what is called Modernism here and on the Continent. The divergence may be briefly indicated by saying that while our Modernists speak of their opponents as Traditionalists, the Continental Modernists speak of theirs as Intellectualists. Two incompatible philosophies underlie these two words. The anti-scholastic theology of Loisy, Le Roy, Blondel, Laberthonière, and more recently of Heiler and Otto, who habitually insist on the 'irrationality' of religious faith, is not the spiritual heir of the Renaissance Platonists, nor of Humanism, if we use the word in its historical meaning. An alliance between Catholic and Protestant Modernism is not easy, because the philosophical basis of the two is widely different. Now that many Liberal Catholics are joining the Churchmen's Union, there will be room for much friendly discussion on a subject even more fundamental than the seat of authority in religion, namely, the meaning, nature, and criteria of truth.

There is only one sentence in Mr. Richardson's book to which I am inclined to take exception. On page 101, under the influence of Professor Pringle Pattison, he speaks of 'an evolution of the divine life in the human race.' No one owes more to Pringle Pattison than I do; but I am afraid it is really impossible to fit the Hegelian God into any scheme of Christian

theism. I doubt whether Mr. Richardson has thought out all that these words imply.

W. R. INGE.

CHRISTIAN TRADITION AND MODERN THOUGHT.*

It is no easy task in a series of short lectures to deal helpfully with the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith; and Canon Quick in asking that his book may be judged by what it contains rather than by what it omits shows that he is himself not unaware of the difficulties which have beset his path. He treats of such great themes as the Grounds for belief in God, the Problem of Evil, the Divinity of Jesus, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Last Judgment, and what he says is clear, arresting, invariably suggestive, and not seldom provocative of a desire to argue on the part of the reader.

In the final lecture on the Holy Spirit and Modern Thought, Canon Quick shows clearly enough his own desire to act in some sense as a mediator between modernist and traditionalist churchmen. We are asked on the one hand to regard Christianity as 'supremely the religion of tradition,' and on the other to recognize it no less clearly as 'supremely the religion of modern thought.' Here is no colourless attempt at an artificial reconciliation of opposites. The double attitude is rendered necessary by the two-fold character of Christianity itself as a religion at once rooted in history and drawing its present life and power from contact with the living Spirit of Truth and Reality. It may be that Canon Quick is somewhat nervously anxious to warn the Modernist against the danger of valuing too lightly the treasures of the past. 'The modernists,' he writes, 'holding to the doctrine of the Living Spirit, are apt to interpret their freedom in a loose and hasty way, which seems to assume that the latest fashion is always inspired, and that the revelation handed down from the past is nothing but an irksome yoke.' Modernists might perhaps retort with reason that here is a generalisation itself somewhat loose and hasty; yet to see ourselves as others see us is without doubt a health-giving experience, and when the criticism comes from so sympathetic an opponent (if opponent he be) as Canon Quick, we shall do well to lay it seriously to heart.

The first lecture on Belief in God shows us something of the lecturer's gifts as a controversialist. The Atheist is roundly challenged to produce a better explanation of the facts than that suggested by the Christian Creed. Agnosticism is branded as 'an intellectual dug-out where a man may not stay if he does not want to be buried.' For in religion as in life decisions have to be made, we must act *as if* we knew, we must make choice from a number of alternative hypotheses which compete for our acceptance. By repudiating in the second lecture the time-worn dilemma between the love and power of God through recourse to the only possible method of refusing to hold the two in opposition, Canon Quick has struck a blow on behalf of the position advocated by Miss Dougall and Mr. Emmet in *The Lord of Thought*. The power of love, it is maintained, is almighty, just because love alone can turn the worst to the best, transforming the criminal's gallows into the banner of a conquering host, changing direst defeat into supremest victory, making evil, in spite of itself, subserve the purposes of good.

The lecture on 'The Godhead of Jesus Christ' is perhaps the most masterly of the series. Canon Quick makes full use of the phrase 'Jesus

* *Christian Beliefs and Modern Questions*, by Oliver Chase Quick. (S.C.M., 1923; 4/- and 2/6.)

has the value of God,' explaining it as meaning that 'the whole estimation of men and things which is characteristic of Jesus is equally characteristic of God.' That is a great contention, but our author is no doubt right in maintaining that by itself it is not enough, since 'Jesus cannot really have the value of God unless He *is* God.' The doctrine of the Incarnation is a doctrine not only of divine revelation, but of divine action, and in Jesus we are given not simply an understanding of what God is like, but the power to become as men what He as man showed us we ought to be.

It is when reading the two lectures on the Resurrection and the Last Judgment that the desire to criticize becomes acute. Not that these contain less that is valuable, less that is suggestive, but rather that their very suggestiveness is a challenge to thought, an invitation to enquire further into the lecturer's meaning. We can agree wholeheartedly that the Christian doctrine of Immortality is much more than a mere assertion of survival, that 'the eternal life which the New Testament offers as its gospel is not continued existence, but a particular kind of existence, namely, life in fellowship with God.' But what is intended by the assertion that 'the resurrection-appearances meant not only that our Lord's spirit or soul survived His body's death, but rather that, because He had altogether in soul and body submitted to death, He had altogether, been in soul and body, restored'? We are told that heathen gospels promised immortality to only part of what we should call the human personality, and in a note at the end of the chapter Canon Quick is careful to lay emphasis on the truth that any belief in a mere reassembling of physical particles is impossible for the educated Christian of to-day. Would he, then, accept the statement that 'nothing which goes into the grave ever comes out of it again'? And if so, what bearing has that dictum on the assertion that our Lord was altogether restored in soul and body. In what respects does that restoration differ from the restoration to which Christians may look forward? And if the survival of the complete human personality is possible apart from any resuscitation of physical particles, what effect had our Lord's complete surrender to death upon the nature of His resurrection body, and by what means are we to suppose that He was able to bear upon that body the visible marks of that surrender?

So, again, while we welcome Canon Quick's frank assurance that 'the traditional form of the Christian Belief in the last Judgment has been largely determined by purely Jewish ideas,' what are we to make of the assertion that '"Depart" to the evil and "Come" to the good' is the one verdict possible for the divine Judge? While it may be true, as Canon Quick asserts, that 'God's final rejection of evil is all that damnation means,' yet it is one thing to reject the sin and a wholly different thing to consign the sinner to an eternal exclusion from the presence of God even though we console ourselves with the consideration that the exclusion is self-inflicted, and so to say, automatic in its working. Though we would not advocate any doctrine of easy-going universalism, it may perhaps be open to doubt whether Canon Quick, in contending for the final rejection of evil, has thought out sufficiently what he conceives to be the ultimate fate of the evil-doer. In discarding the Jewish framework he must be careful to reject no less decisively the Jewish doctrine of a God who could triumph over sin only by the destruction of the sinner. It is at least arguable that to rest content with a doctrine of divine exclusion is tantamount to the admission that God can permanently fail. And if that is possible, what becomes of a God who is almighty with the relentless omnipotence of redeeming love?

W.M.P.

'*ECCLESIA ANGLICANA*'; FOR WHAT DOES SHE STAND?*

The Bishop of Durham is taking an increasingly prominent place as the defender of what is called 'the historic position of the Church of England' as against those who would identify it, alike in doctrine and practice as far as possible with the Church of Rome. His latest book consists of an acute examination of Anglo-Catholic claims. This forms an Introduction, which is followed by a reprint of the two letters addressed by Dr. Henson to the *Morning Post* last July (soon after the London Anglo-Catholic Congress), together with four sermons preached in Westminster Abbey or elsewhere, and his charge to the Ordination Candidates for Trinity, 1923. Last, but not least, there is an address delivered to the Churchmen's Union as long ago as 1915.

The later developments of Anglo-Catholicism Dr. Henson regards as fundamentally opposed to the position of the English Church as defined by the Reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and as embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. Anglo-Catholics, in his opinion, have emancipated themselves from their Ordination vow that they did personally accept and endorse that version of Christianity set forth in the Anglican formularies; recognizing no authority within the Church of England, they appeal to the larger Catholic Church, which is, in effect, the Church of Rome, the authority of whose Visible Head is being increasingly recognised by them. Thus we are told that the Anglo-Catholic Movement now demands that—

> 'the entire Reformation settlement embodied in the legal establishment of the Church of England shall be cancelled, and English clergymen left free to adopt as much of it as they like, or to repudiate the whole of it, at their unfettered discretion' (p. 12),

and in a damaging criticism of the recently published 'Congress Books' he remarks—

> 'The writers rarely appeal to the standard documents of the Church of England and never quote the great English divines. English Church History between the accession of Elizabeth and the rise of the Tractarians is completely ignored' (p. 11).

The result of the progress of this movement is the breakdown of all authority within the English Church issuing in a chaos to no small extent responsible for the diminishing influence exerted by the Church. Indeed, to the Bishop's mind, the movement threatens to break up the Church of England, for—

> 'the mass of English Churchmen will not become "Anglo-Catholics," but they may be forced to cease to be Anglicans' (p. 25).

The methods and the results of the 'Catholicising' of English parish churches are described on p. 62:

> 'The parishioners have been amazingly patient.' [We do not consider it 'amazing' considering their helplessness.] 'All over the country the parish churches are being emptied by the introduction of "Anglo-Catholic" innovations. That is the first stage in which the ground is cleared. There the priest begins from the bottom and gradually draws together a congregation which acquiesces in his methods and accepts his teaching. This is the second stage in which a congregational plea for the novel system is manufactured. The parishioners, wronged and ignored, have either fallen out of religious observances altogether, or betaken themselves to the Nonconformist churches.'

* *In Defence of the English Church*, by the Right Reverend H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. (Hodder and Stoughton; 2/6 net.)

This is an admirably just statement of a procedure inflicted, not infrequently, on flourishing congregations, and justified by the plea that the former congregations were in a state of spiritual starvation for lack of what is called the 'full faith.' But what about the Bishops who have acquiesced in this procedure and are still acquiescing in it, if not actually encouraging it?

Dr. Henson's plan for dealing with this lamentable situation is well known, and meets with much opposition, chiefly from those who have no remedy of their own to propose. For Dr. Henson's remedy is to call in the Law. He writes:

> 'The unchecked autocracy of the incumbent, not within the law, but without it must be checked.'

And again:

> 'Law cannot be limited to securing the clergyman in his benefice: it must extend to compelling him to fulfil the conditions on which he holds it.'

To secure justice to the parishioners, the Bishops—

> 'must be armed with authority, not merely to issue orders, but also to make sure that their orders are obeyed,'

and Dr. Henson complains of the humble *rôle* allotted to the Bishops in the Anglo-Catholic scheme. Where episcopal recognition is sought, it means that the Bishop is merely asked to approve *un fait accompli*.

To the last complaint it must be replied that the Bishops have been well content to fill it for a long time past. Their relationship to the various schools of thought has too closely resembled that of the military God to the largest army. The Anglo-Catholics have allotted to the Bishops the only *rôle* they could possibly expect them to fill, and the recent futile parleying with Rome is the measure of the accuracy of their expectations. They could reasonably reply that Dr. Henson's respect for episcopal wisdom and authority seems to have been born of the exercise of the episcopal office. At the time of his nomination to the see of Hereford, Dr. Henson was reminded of an occasion when he not only ignored an inhibition served upon him by Bishop Gore, but let it be known that the document was framed and hung upon his study wall and was among his most valued possessions.

The first impression made on Modernists by this book will probably be unfavourable. It certainly lacks 'sweet reasonableness' in tone and seems to threaten the advent of a tyrannical prelacy, but it will be observed that it is lawless action and the treasonable appeal to unlawful authority and not freedom of thought and teaching entailed by modern science and criticism, which the Bishop desires to curb and suppress. And unless Modernists believe that there is no longer need for a Church at all, or else have dreamed that the millenium is already with us, they will recognize that Dr. Henson's argument against Anglo-Catholic claims is unanswerable.

> 'No self-respecting Church can possibly concede that demand to its officers. Such liberty belongs, and can only belong, to private persons, uncommissioned, unpledged, and we must add, unbeneficed and unpaid. Every English clergyman is ordained, and holds office on the explicit understanding that he does personally accept and endorse that version of the truth which the Church of England has formulated. Nothing short of this can provide any security to the congregations against individual vagaries of doctrine and practice.'

Enough has been said to indicate the character of this little book. We warmly commend it to our readers, for Dr. Henson is not contending for

a slavish adhesion to the literal sense of sixteenth and seventeenth century documents. He is fully conscious of their inadequacy in our time, and states plainly that the Church which formulated them can and should revise them. The Bishop is contending for a principle, *viz.* that the Church of England has the right to decree her own rites and ceremonies, and if this were accepted he would be ready to consider the doctrinal standard even of the 'Green Book' as coming within the limits of the English Church. Dr. Henson does not wish to transfer the 'unchecked autocracy' from the individual incumbent to the individual Bishop, but rather to prevent appeals to that authority which our Church has definitely rejected. The spirit of the Reformation, with its results on education, has made Modernism possible; it would become impossible inside the Church if Anglo-Catholicism became dominant, for Anglo-Catholicism denies the very principle of liberty in such words as these:

> 'We cannot be content to be for ever a mere section of a Church, part of which, with equal recognition from authority, contradicts our teaching and denies our claim' (p. 56).

A perusal of Dr. Henson's book will show, from Anglo-Catholic writers, in what that teaching and claim consists.

We hope that all our readers will ponder the Bishop of Durham's words, for we are persuaded that only in the success of some such policy as he advocates is there any future in the Church of England for freedom and sound learning, and therefore for the Church of England herself.

J.S.B.

VOICES FROM THE PAST.*

The Argument from Design, *i.e.* that from the existence of design in Nature it is legitimate to infer the existence of a Designer, is generally held to have been disposed of by Darwin, who explained the aerial aptitude of a swallow not in terms of 'design,' but in terms of 'adaptation to environment.' The swallow is the resultant of two factors—(i) a tendency in organisms to exhibit variations, and (ii) an exacting environment. Furthermore, the idea of a First Cause—an idea of which the Argument from Design is a sub-species—had already been analysed by that critic of preconceived ideas, Immanuel Kant, who denied ultimate validity to human ideas of causation.

Nevertheless, Lord Balfour has recently told us that the Argument from Design still carries great weight with him, and he has developed and elaborated it in a somewhat new form, including an able argument from the presence of Beauty in Nature, and from our appreciation of it.

Unless we mistake him, Mr. Shebbeare's argument has a good deal in common with that of the distinguished author of *Theism and Humanism*. And it may certainly be said that he will convince those who desire to be convinced, or who already have reasons (or what they may hold to be reasons) for theistic belief. Nevertheless, we believe that he would find it very difficult to persuade students of the origins of the aesthetic emotions to agree with him. Beauty, and our appreciation of it, is nowadays interpreted in terms of sex-psychology, or something of that sort—or, again in terms of adaptation to environment, and so forth. These may not be adequate interpretations, but, so far as they go, they are scientific, and men of science will not, at present, move beyond the limits set by them, however attractive those regions may seem into which Mr. Shebbeare beckons them.

* *The Design Argument Reconsidered.* A Discussion between the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare and Joseph McCabe, with an Introduction by Prof. C. C. J. Webb. (Watts and Co., 1923; 3/6 net.)

Mr. Shebbeare is inclined to slip into the 'either-or' fallacy, and Professor Webb, in his nicely non-committal introduction, condones this trespassing on dangerous ground. He writes:

> 'I am convinced that the point chiefly urged by Mr. Shebbeare is of great importance—namely, that we must face the fact that those who reject the "Argument from Design" in any form are committed to the view that much in the world is really *accidental* which it is extremely difficult to regard as such.'

But both 'design' and 'accident' may be, and indeed probably are, mere 'anthropomorphisms,' *i.e.* purely human ways of looking at things; and to suppose that they exhaust the possibilities strikes one as a trifle fantastic—altogether pre-Kantian, in fact.

Yet, if we are not persuaded by Mr. Shebbeare, we are no more convinced by Mr. McCabe. We have always felt sympathy with this able champion of secularism and foe of superstition, not because we agree with him, but because we admire his sincerity, and dislike obscurantism and clericalism which he dislikes. Yet Mr. McCabe still strikes us as a contemporary of Paley, though, to be sure, he is on the side of Paley's opponents. In fact, if for once we may tell the truth, a strange odour of antiquity seems to us to hang over these superannuated polemics about design. The thought of our age has moved on; nor is the theistic problem itself now the most important religious problem—or at least not the theistic problem as it seems to present itself to these two controversialists.

J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS OF CONFESSION.*

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The Roman Catholic Church is to a great extent a *Terra Incognita* to those outside it; they are apt both to blame and praise it excessively and indiscriminately from want of knowledge of the facts. It is, in truth, a mixed magnitude; and the important letter on 'Confession in the English Church' suggests a few considerations, based on experience, of what is known as the Sacrament of Penance on its native ground. The attempts made to revive Sacramentalism among us are often based on psychology or on pragmatism. The system, it is urged, corresponds to a persistent need of human nature; and it works. By Sacramentalism is meant not the devout use of the two great Sacraments of the Gospel, but the tendency to materialise and localise the Divine working in such a manner as, in effect, to narrow it down to certain fixed channels, and to confine it to certain rites performed by clergymen ordained in a particular way. There was never a conception of religion which did not in the first instance commend itself on practical grounds; and among the practical grounds on which these misbeliefs and malpractices have commended themselves that of psychology holds a prominent place. This or that belief or practice rises out of the soil of the human mind—a soil which is luxuriant, and produces mixed crops. It is useful for the purpose in hand; people take to it. This, it is thought, is sufficient justification, and many of us are irritated if we are asked, Is the belief true? or, What are, what Paley calls it, its 'general consequences'? or, Is the practice on the lines of human advance?

It is, perhaps, not unnatural that the decline of observance, and in general of institutional religion among us, should produce a reaction in

* A Paper read at the Conference of the Churchmen's Union.

this direction among devout people. I confess (though I hope I may be mistaken) that I can see little sign of a revival of religion in this sense of the word; and that the measures taken to promote such a revival seem to me to have had little or no result. But the way out of the difficulty lies onward, not backward. No good can be done—and much harm will be—by looking back with Lot's wife to the Burning Cities—*i.e.* beliefs and modes of worship which the experience of mankind (an experience which comes to us *non sine numine*) has outgrown. Childhood has a charm—but only in children. In grown men it is senility or second childhood: 'When I became a man I put away childish things.'

Among the usages which the Christian conscience has tried and found wanting, that of Sacramental Confession stands high. An Anglican clergyman has recently published a work entitled *The Moral Theology of the Sacrament of Penance*,[1] and the notice-boards of many of our churches announce the hours at which confessions are heard. If Sacramental Confession could be regarded as a mere luxury of devotion it would be practised by few, nor even in their case would the practice probably be long-lived. But both experience and the reason of the thing show that it cannot be kept on a voluntary level. Once admitted, development is inevitable: it becomes, with perfect consistency, a moral obligation, and, where circumstances permit, a positive law.

Its authority is ecclesiastical, not Scriptural. Had the famous passage in the Fourth Gospel (xx. 23) been understood by the Church of the time to institute a special Sacrament for the remission of sin after baptism, the long and bitter disputes which came to a head in the Novatian controversy could not have arisen. Their prevalence is conclusive evidence that the words were not understood by either party in this sense. And, as a fact, what is called the Sacrament of Penance owed its origin not to the needs of souls demanding assurance of forgiveness—this, though it came in, came in much later, and was secondary—but to the desire of the hierarchy, for practical purposes, to stiffen the discipline and organisation of the Church.

It is impossible to take so old and so widespread a practice as an abstraction, *i.e.* prescinding from the beliefs on which it is based, its history, its working in the Church of our own time. Its dogmatic basis is laid down in the 'Catechism of Christian Doctrine' put forward by the English Roman Catholic Bishops and taught in their schools. This tells us that 'Penance is a Sacrament whereby the sins, whether mortal or venial, which we have committed after baptism are forgiven,' and that 'Our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Penance when He breathed on His Apostles, and gave them power to forgive sins, saying, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven."' If this is so, the obligation imposed is certain; and no question as to the practical working of the system can be entertained. Such teaching, however, is not that of the Reformed Churches in general, or of the Church of England in particular, and it is repudiated both by the knowledge and the conscience of our time. It is on those, therefore, who favour, not on those who oppose, the restoration of this 'commonly called' Sacrament—which Article xxv. describes as having 'grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles'—that the burden of proof lies. They will look for this proof in vain in antiquity. For the mediæval is not the primitive, or even the patristic. Hooker is explicit: 'I dare boldly affirm that for many hundred years after Christ the Fathers held no such opinion; they did not gather by our Saviour's words any such necessity of seeking the priest's absolution from sin by secret and (as they now term it) Sacramental confession.' And, 'It was not then the faith or

[1] The Rev. Watkin W. Williams. (A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1917.)

doctrine of God's Church, as of the Papacy at this present, (1) that the only remedy for sin after baptism is Sacramental penitency; (2) that confession in secret is an essential part thereof. . . . No, no; these opinions have youth in their countenance; antiquity knew them not; it never thought nor dreamed of them.'[2]

What may be called the common-sense case against the Confessional has often been crudely put. But it dates from a time when the system, which some of us now look at through a haze of unreal romance, was fresh in men's memory; and it is easier to criticise its form than to evade its cogency. Can interior acts be brought under external categories? Can we really think that the categorical enumeration of sins, with their distinguishing circumstances, is possible? or that, if it were possible, it could serve any moral purpose? Can we tolerate the idea of women and children being exposed to the gross handling prescribed by the Casuists at the discretion of men of, at best, no more than average judgment, taste, temper, and virtue? Surely only one answer can be given. When scandals occur those concerned have the strongest reasons for silence, so that their being kept secret need not surprise us, though the law of averages forbids us to suppose them non-existent or very exceptional. And there is no reason to credit the Roman Catholic clergy with a double dose of sin, actual or original. They are very much like any other clergy: if our own were placed in their circumstances the consequences would probably be much the same. The practical results of the system are written large in human nature and in history; it is foolish to think that they will vary when a frontier is crossed or a century begun. And if a certain number of persons insist on adopting it—here, of course, they must do as they will—it is better worked by professionals than by amateurs. The Roman Catholic clergy have a living authority, an established tradition, and a more or less efficacious public opinion behind them. And there is no mystery, or false sentiment, about it; the thing is a matter of course on each side. In *The Confessions of a Convert,* the late Monsignor Benson describes his experience as an Anglican Confessor. He 'trembled with excitement,' he tells us, and returned home 'with a sense of awful and splendid guilt.' It was folly of this sort which made the learned and excellent Lingard say that the Oxford converts 'talked like lunatics or old women.' The Catholic priest puts on his stole with as little excitement as his great coat, and listens with resignation neither 'awful' nor 'splendid' to the *péchés ennuyeuses* which form his daily tale.

What of the moral value of the system? If we take populations as a test it seems to be small. The English who do not confess have certainly less affective piety, and are less careful in the matter of religious observance than the Irish, who do. But there are compensations. The English are less drunken, less untruthful, less given to and less tolerant of certain peculiarly odious forms of political and agrarian crime. Again, our standard of sex morality is higher than that of Continental Catholic countries; and our regard for human life is greater—there are fewer murders in England than in Italy or Spain. I do not say that this is *because* these countries have the Confessional and we have not: *post hoc* is not necessarily *propter hoc*. But certainly the Confessional has not enabled these nations to 'let the ape and tiger die'; we have made more progress without it than they with it; it has proved an ineffectual check upon crime. Historically, as I said, this was not its purpose; its origin was legal, not ethical or religious. But its advocates will not easily admit this fact.

Its results upon communities may well seem decisive; for what is the community but an aggregate of individuals? But a few words on its value

[2] *Ecclesiastical Polity,* vi. 4.

to individuals as such may be said. A victim of Pius X's U-boat campaign against Modernism said to the late Father Tyrrell, 'I shall miss the facile absolution round the corner.' 'If you can really think that it does you any good,' was his dry answer. He knew by experience the unreality of the craving felt; of the satisfaction administered; and of the relief bestowed. And here the working of the system in a church in which it is a recognised institution must be our guide. With Anglicans confession is—I will not say a new toy—but a novelty; it is used by enthusiasts, not by the rank and file. I cannot help thinking that on a larger field experience shows that even for the individual as such it is of little use for any moral purpose. For the sins which people take with them to confession are seldom their real, or root, sins. With regard to these they make themselves a false conscience; a very easy thing to do. The natural man is a born, if an unconscious, casuist. The confessor hears little of commercial dishonesty; of the tricks of trade; of that 'state of mere unprofitableness' which Paley reminds us 'will not go unpunished'; of the selfishness and ill-temper which so often poison married and family life. The more essential sins seem to lie outside words. 'There is neither speech nor language'; they 'are spiritually discerned.'

In the case of certain definite sins of habit, confession is at times helpful to persons of emotional temperament. It seldom frees them from these habits; recidivity, or back-sliding, is a feature of sins of this sort. But it enables them to react against the despondency into which they might fall without it, and gives them what seems a fresh start with a clean slate. It is obvious, however, that these advantages are bought at a high price, and counter-balanced by serious moral drawbacks. Sacramental Magic easily takes the place of moral effort; emotion that of piety; sensibility that of sense. And it may seem that the good elements in the process might be secured without these drawbacks and by less equivocal means.

In many cases, with those who use it habitually, confession becomes rather a ritual observance than a moral act. A priest, *e.g.*, will confess before celebrating, or a layman before Communion, very much in the way in which the celebrant washes his fingers in the sacristy before Mass, or at the *Lavabo* during it. So the Jews of our Lord's time 'except they wash, eat not.' There is, perhaps, little harm in practices of this sort; but is there any good? And they certainly lead to formalism. I remember a priest who, hearing the confessions of school children, was struck by the fact that one after another said, 'I stole my mother's sugar.' 'Why did you do it?' he asked. And the answer was, 'Please, Father, so as to have something to confess.'

We need not end on a negative note. A real want of human nature underlies the demand made by certain sensitive and devout persons for confession; had it not been so the practice could never have obtained its hold upon so large a part of mankind. But this want mistakes both its own nature and the relief for which it calls. The soul is not made for solitude; by many the pain of interior loneliness is acutely felt. Privacy is one thing, isolation another; the intrusion of rude hands is resented where the action of spirit on spirit is a pressing need. The reserve which convention and national temperament impose upon so many of us in these matters is carried very much too far. It is recorded among the misdeeds of the Philistines that they 'stopped the wells' dug in former days by Abraham's servants, and 'filled them with earth' (Gen. xxvi. 15). The Philistines are ever with us—particularly in England; and this stopping of the wells is a source of real weakness in English religion. Yet let us see that we re-open them where the living waters flow. The 'royal priesthood' of which the Apostolic writer speaks is not as Aaron's; its proto-

type is neither Caiaphas nor the Casuists, but Christ. This priesthood is a temperament, not an order; the priest is born, and 'born of God,' not made. His distinctive gift—that of acting as a conductor, or transmitter, of spiritual energy—is independent of state or calling; it does not come with imposition of hands. Many a layman, often a very simple person, possesses it—many a good and sympathetic woman; it knows no distinction of culture, age, or sex. 'Who can forgive sins, save God only?' True: but those of whom we speak, their lips touched by the coal from the heavenly altar, can awaken in our duller consciousness the blessed knowledge that God has forgiven our sins. To such is committed, not of men, but of God, 'the ministry of reconciliation.' He has given them 'power and commandment to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.'

ALFRED FAWKES.

The Vicarage, Ashby St. Ledgers,
31*st December*, 1923.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION AT THE CROSS ROADS.

SIR,

In your admirable article on Prayer Book Revision in your December issue there is a point which I believe to be both an error of fact and liable to mislead. On p. 499, in the second of your 'weighty considerations' in favour of the proposal of Alternative Uses, I read:

> 'And here, we need hardly add, that any congregation which prefers to adhere to the present Prayer Book Services shall have a perfect right to do so. All parties are agreed on that.'

(1) What is the *guarantee* that the congregation (or even the Bishop) would have any such right, or that, then as now, the congregation would not be at the mercy of the incumbent?

(2) So far from all parties being agreed as to the right of the parishioners to decide, the Anglo-Catholic party denies any such right to the laity in matters of doctrine, worship, or ceremonial; the determination of these is held to lie exclusively in the hands of the clergy.

I fear, Sir, that your considerations in favour of Alternative Uses are less weighty than they would otherwise be, when it is remembered that the proposal presupposes conditions which do not exist, are not likely to exist, and which a large, possibly the largest, section of the Church is determined shall not exist. If the proposal for Alternative Uses is adopted under present conditions, the 'Catholicising' of our Services will proceed as it is doing at present, with the difference that the incumbent could use a form of Service to his liking which would also have official sanction behind it. The laity would have less than no remedy, and could only register their protest by the ineffectual method of absenting themselves from their parish churches.

J. STANLEY BEZZANT.

Hartlebury,
January 3rd, 1924.

[If our correspondent diagnoses the situation rightly, and we think he does, then it is most important, as we urged in the article to which he refers, that the parochial laity shall be given legal right to control the parochial services. This should include not only the service, but also the hour. We hear of autocratic efforts to deprive parishioners of the services they desire by putting these services at inconvenient times.—ED., *M.C.*]